DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 663 EC 122 727

AUTHOR	Larsh, Edward, Ed.
TITLE	Someone's Priority: The Issues and Recommendations on the State of the Arts and Gifted in America.
INSTITUTION	Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	92p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Colorado State Department of Education, USOE Federal Building, 1961 Stout St., Denver, CO 80294 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Aesthetic Education: *Art Education: Conference Reports: Evaluation Methods: *Gifted: Historical Reviews: *Music: Student Evaluation: *Talented Students: *Talent Identification

ABSTRACT

Seven papers focus on the role of the arts with gifted students. E. Larsh presents an historical perspective, citing the existence of innovative arts programs as well as the vulnerability of arts budgets in terms of fiscal crisis. Larsh discusses recommendations from the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted, including collection and dissemination of existing curricula and program models. M. Sidlin, symphony conductor, considers music as a statement of human conviction, and recommends a program of music literacy for grades K-12. Musician L. Hollander adds his personal experiences, while C. Wing, Jr. addresses issues involved in identification of artistically talented students. Musically talented students are the topic of R. Petzold's paper. C. Dorn suggests construction of criterion referenced arts evaluation procedures supervised by a national testing agency. A paper prepared by staff members of several of the major national associations on behalf of the Assembly of National Arts Education Organizations addresses roles for professional arts education. In a final paper, H. Burgart reviews the needs of avocational arts education. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181663

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOMEONE'S PRIORITY

THE ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE STATE OF THE ARTS AND GIFTED IN AMERICA

EDWARD LARSH, EDITOR

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward Larsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PUBLISHED BY: THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EC 132 737

COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Jacquie Haughton, Chairman . . . . . Lakewood
(Second Congressional District)

Allen B. Lamb, Vice Chairman . . . . . Windsor
(Fourth Congressional District)

Betty Gilliss . . . . . Aurora
(Fifth Congressional District)

Dorothy Gotlieb . . . . . Denver
(First Congressional District)

Frank J. Ricotta . . . . . Pueblo
(Third Congressional District)

Education 79-1686 1M
Someone's Priority
July 1979
Price $3.00
No charge to Colorado Public Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface . . . . . (v)

Foreword. 1
Historical Perspective 4
Issues and Recommendations. 12
Edward Larsh

"Music as a Statement of Human Conviction"
Murry Sidlin. 30

Extemporaneous Speech
Lorin Hollander 41

"Talents: Recognize Their Diversity or Lose Them"
Cliff W. Wing Jr. 51

"Identification of Musically Talented Students"
Robert G. Petzold 58

"A Statement for the Office of Gifted and Talented"
Charles M. Dorn 66

Paper on the Arts for Gifted and Talented Students. 71

"The Gifted and Talented Amateur: Avocational Arts Education"
Herbert J. Burgart 80

Acknowledgements 86

1978 - 1980
EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

IMPROVING COMPUTATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF BASIC SKILLS:

The Colorado Department of Education, through the accountability process and other proven methods, will help schools analyze and improve student skills in reading, writing, speaking, listening and mathematics.

IMPROVEMENT OF DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS:

The Department will assist schools to achieve a learning climate for improved student discipline to enhance the learning process.

IMPROVEMENT OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION:

The Department will assist schools and libraries by coordinating and integrating state, local, and federal programs to strengthen their skills in research, evaluation, and planning, for effective use of financial and human resources.

IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN EDUCATION:

The Department will work with schools to improve public confidence in education through practical means including the state's accountability and accreditation processes and through increased involvement of the total community in the public school system.

IMPROVEMENT OF EQUALITY OF ACCESS TO INFORMATION:

The Department will identify and improve programs which assure equal access to information to help all Colorado citizens meet occupation, educational, and leisure time interests.

IMPROVEMENT OF LEADERSHIP AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

The Department will further efforts to strengthen leadership skills of all professional staffs in the Department of Education, schools, boards of cooperative services, and libraries and library systems through increased inservice programs planned and offered cooperatively with higher education and other appropriate organizations.

PREFACE

The arts and the gifted in America are education issues which compete for scarce resources in most school systems. As this publication suggests, the issues must be made "someone's priority" in order for them to be a responsive structure in American education.

How does an issue, or more directly, arts and gifted, become a priority?

It seems to me that unless we go about making an issue a priority, the issue becomes a "non-issue": it loses, eventually, to the next issue's ability to dominate the education spectrum.

This set of proceedings and papers should allow educators to take the issue of arts and gifted education before their constituents and begin a dialog of priority setting. I would hope, however, in fairness to all issues, that the dialog be preceded by a very important first step: establish why the program should exist. Without that frame of reference, or philosophy if you will, intelligent, rational decisions about pieces of the whole are often left vulnerable to the emotional appeals of the few.

Comprehensive planning for all school-aged youth requires nothing less than a commitment from all from all segments of our society to know and understand the issues, define the right of existence for programs and, indeed, make those issues "someone's priority." It is hoped that this publication will offer a realistic starting point for the very important dialogs to come.

William C. Dean, Assistant Commissioner
Colorado Department of Education
Denver, Colorado

FOREWORD

What's it like to be gifted and talented in America today? For that matter, how do we identify a gifted person? What opportunities, or lack of opportunities, are there for those we recognize and define as gifted and talented? And how can we, as a people who believe in the importance of art in education, not only as an end in itself, but as a means to a more profound understanding of humanity, help to make the arts a more valued part of our lives and our educational system. What recommendations can we make? What policies can we initiate? What steps can we take to bring about a full marriage between the gifted and talented and those interested in expanding their abilities and opportunities, and those who seek to bring the gifted's spirited work to all of us?

These are neither new questions nor new concerns for those involved in educating America's citizens in the arts. They are questions which have been asked for as long as we've sought to achieve a universal, educational system that educates all of a person, which means not only teaching those valued cognitive skills which are imperative to a successful life in a modern culture, it also means providing opportunities for the development of an artistic sense and artistic capabilities, especially for those gifted individuals who often find the schoolhouse a place not of enlightment, but of frustration.

It often seems that there are as many opinions and answers as there are voices raised in search of a balanced educational system. How do we best meet the needs of our citizens, our handicapped, our minorities, and disadvantaged, our gifted and talented? How do we provide opportunities for all, so that our educational system instills in each person a sense of excellence, a sense of the infinite possibilities that knowledge and achievement in a field brings, no matter what course an individual ultimately charts for life.

If we cannot realistically meet the complete educational needs of all of the people all the time, then who, in the hard development of priorities, ends up holding the short end of the stick? The answer ultimately comes down to what we perceive to be essential for a fulfilling life in our culture. A life that not only enriches the individual, but also society at large.

Obviously then, given only so many educational resources, there are tough decisions to be made. What is essential, what is not. Where do we commit ourselves, where do we hold back. The issues at hand are numerous and complex. Our decisions rest in our beliefs. And in the area of art in education and art opportunities for the gifted and talented, a variety of divergent beliefs and decisions have often produced mixed results in the schools of America. So the questions regarding the place of the arts in education still need to be asked and answers sought, because of the continuing need to broaden and integrate the arts in our society, and because of new, and at times disturbing, trends in the economic and social forces which affect in ways obvious and subtle, the course of American education.

The exploration of these felt needs and issues surrounding the arts and the gifted today was the topic of concern for the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted, held in Aspen, Colorado, June, 1978, by the United States Office of Education. The conference was a natural extension of the

work completed earlier in 1978 by the National Task Force on the Gifted and Talented, established by Dr. Ernest Boyer, United States Commissioner of Education. Realizing the importance of the visual and performing arts in our society, the Task Force chose this area of need as one of three primary thrusts, the other two being teacher training in gifted and talented, and the study of minority disadvantaged gifted and talented students. Yet, these three areas do overlap as evidenced by the tremendous need for teachers skilled in nurturing talent in the visual and performing arts, and the equally important need to reach out and teach minority and disadvantaged people in the arts.

The National Task Force on the Gifted and Talented had three objectives: (1) to survey on-going efforts for gifted and talented in the Office of Education; (2) to make legislative recommendations for gifted and talented; and (3) to offer recommendations to the Commissioner for exemplary means and strategies to meet the educational need of the gifted and talented.

Earlier in the year the Task Force accomplished these three objectives and the Aspen conference was their opportunity to explore, with the participants, the issues and concerns facing the arts and the gifted today. In meeting this responsibility, the prime goal of the conference was to develop a series of recommendations for the governmental agencies which will aid them in formulating future policies for the arts and the gifted. As Dorothy Sisk, Director of the Gifted and Talented Program for the U.S. Office of Education said, "It is our firm desire that through our combined efforts here in Aspen for the gifted and talented in the visual and performing arts, that we will not only identify and nurture one of our most precious resources, that of our talented youth, but that we will also rekindle a real commitment to the arts by education."

These are important, even vital, goals for our educational system, but ones not easily attained. And this fact was evident in the sense of purpose the participants brought to the conference. They gathered on a late spring afternoon at the Aspen Institute for Humanisitic Studies, some three hundred individuals involved in the arts and education: writers, artists, educators, administrators, conductors, teachers. They came from all over America to discuss, learn from each other and reaffirm the importance of the arts in our culture. "The thing that drives us all to this conference," said author and educator Harold Taylor, "is a belief that in the arts we have some basic humane values which are the core of contemporary and past civilizations. And what we're trying to do at a conference like this, is by sharing the experiences of musicians, poets, writers, educators, and organizers of the arts, find ways in which the basic values in human life can be celebrated as part of the school system."

Like its historic predecessor, the 1974 Spearfish conference held on the campus of Black Hills State College in South Dakota, the Aspen conference on the arts and gifted was concerned with examining both general education in the arts and, more specifically, the identification and educational nurturing of our gifted and talented. The conference was a combination of general sessions, workshops, and performances. The general sessions provided a guiding framework for the conference and a forum for presentations; the workshops, divided between special interest and primary theme workshops, concentrated on the nuts and bolts issues facing the arts in education with each primary theme group reporting out recommendations for their area of study. The performances, interspersed throughout the conference, highlighted the variety of expression found in visual and performing arts.

The setting for this exchange of ideas was well-suited to the task at hand. The high granite peaks, crisp air, and unhurried pace of Aspen town life subtly blend together to invigorate the mind and body. The soaring, quiet beauty of the surroundings seems to naturally instill a sense of the unlimited possibilities of human thought and asperations. Situated in this creative environment, the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies provided a framework for discussion and action free from disturbances and distractions; freeing the conference participants to concentrate and develop national and state policy initiatives for the arts and the gifted which will aid in making the arts a more integral part of all of our lives. "One justification for the Aspen Institute," said James Smith, Jr., Vice-Chairman, Board of Trustees for the Aspen Institute, "lies in its ability to aid others achieve excellence." This certainly was no less than the goal set for the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted.

The Forum revealed the complexity indicating that there are no easy or simple solutions in accomplishing the goal of parity for the arts and the gifted. The essence of the Forum, however, could be reduced to three provocative statements. Lorin Hollander in his magnificent speech said, "The arts are basic, they are most basic and everything spins from that." Harold Taylor said, "What good is it if we learn to read if all we read is the TV Guide;" and Murry Sidlin summed it up by saying, "I'm so frightened when I read about the defense budget more and more. It's beginning to look to me as though the entire budget of the NEA and NEH would run the Pentagon and CIA for about eight hours--and that must be someone's priority."

Edward Larsh

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

by Edward Larsh

Since the 1960's, there has been a tremendous growth in the development of, interest in, and support for the arts in America. In the public sector, new institutions have been created and new programs established in the visual and performing arts at the Federal, state, and local level. In the private sector, the arts are increasingly being woven into the fabric of American life through the expansion or creation of new theatre and dance companies, symphonies and orchestras, and through increased support for the arts and artists in all disciplines. In "Coming to our Senses," a 1977 report by the American Council for the Arts in Education, it was reported that "according to estimates by the N.E.A., between 1965 and 1975, the number of professional orchestras doubled; resident professional theatres quadrupled; arts councils quintupled; and resident professional dance companies increased sevenfold!"

For the arts in America, the total picture is certainly rosier than it was twenty or thirty years ago. We no longer speak of islands of art--New York, Chicago, San Francisco--surrounded by cities and communities where the arts are an occasional flourish; warmly received but hazily appreciated and certainly not considered an integral part of life. The arts are now perceived to be a daily part of existence in many communities throughout America.

In this nook and cranny journey across the country, the arts have gained in strength, have gathered in new audiences, and have maintained a remarkable depth of performance and quality of work in the process, for talent has kept pace with decentralization. The number of artists has expanded to meet the expanded demand. Some of this pool of talent is new, other artists have been there all the time, many overlooked simply because no one perceived a need or expressed an interest in their special, creative abilities. This is changing. But before we pat ourselves on the back, a few more statistics should be kept in mind. Murry Sidlin, Conductor, New Haven Symphony Orchestra, commented at the conference:

> "Too often today the young musicians simply cannot find employment in the early years equal to the residency of the physician or the beginning position in a law firm available to young lawyers. There are only 38 orchestras in America today which pay the musicians anything near a fulltime living wage and only about 15 of those 38 offer salaries of real significance. There are even fewer than 38 fulltime chamber ensembles, and if each orchestra is comprised of an average of 95 muscians, and each ensemble averages four people, one can see how few musicians in America are actually stable in their careers. In the May 1978 International Musician, the trade organ of the Amercian Federation of Musicians, only 28 openings existed in all of the 38 major orchestras for the entire country for next season."

These figures reflect a sobering side of the growth of the arts in America, and indicate how excessively limited art opportunities in orchestra music were twenty years ago, and even with a doubling of orchestras in the past

decade, how limited opportunities remain today. This dichotomy of growth matched with limited opportunities is evident in other fields of art. This reality is also pronouncedly evident in the more specific area of structuring and integrating the arts in education. For like some marvelous half-restored Greek mosaic, some vital pieces of the picture are entirely missing; while other sections, either through a lack of interest, awareness, or unified concern, are suffering from a case of benign neglect. At present, there is both a sense of "guarded optimism" in some quarters and serious concern in others regarding the arts in education and art opportunities for the gifted and talented.

Obviously, the questions concerning the arts and the gifted cannot be dissected and examined in a vacuum. They are inextricably intertwined with the goals and purposes of our total education system. "The arts, gifted, and education," as Gene Wenner, Arts Education Co-ordinator, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., said at the conference, "are a triadic relationship." So where does this triad with all of its problems and possibilities lead? Certainly, it is a complicated relationship. There is one thing, however, as Gene Wenner mentioned, "that is absolutely critical. And that's the fact that we begin to evidence, both in words and deeds, that we're truly going in the same direction, that we truly are cooperating and collaborating."

So what has been accomplished in this triadic relationship over the last twenty years? The answer, in many cases, is a great deal. In other cases, the answer is not enough, or nothing. A situation exists similiar to that faced by scientists involved in analyzing the ever increasing data filtered back to us by our magnificent probes into deep space. Each piece of knowledge gained creates new questions, each new idea necessitates the re-evaluation of older concepts, each problem solved creates new concerns and new priorities, and each step forward not only aids us in deciding where we need to go, but also highlights the inadequacies and deficits in our present system of gathering, analyzing, disseminating and utilizing knowledge for the benefit of our people.

In the area of providing access to general educational opportunities for all Americans - the primary concern over the past twenty years for Federal and some state and local institutions - the record has been surprisingly good. Today, there are literally millions of minority and underprivileged children and adults who we would not have previously expected to complete an education or attain satisfactory work, who are doing just that. We're spending billions of dollars in Federal and state efforts to reach each child - to keep them in school - and to create an atmosphere wherein each segment of our society sees the value in seeking higher educational attainment. And as Edwin Martin, Deputy Commissioner, Education of the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, said at the conference:

> "We have 3 1/2 million children with handicaps enrolled in educational programs across the United States. We have more than three million young people going to colleges and universities under a three billion dollar Federal grant program, and we've increased participation of minority group children by some five or six hundred percent in attaining a higher education. We have Head Start programs, community colleges, technical institutes and a variety of other activites, all of which represent magnificent

efforts on the part of the people to extend access and equal opportunities to all of our citizens in a way that has not previously been done by any civilized nation."

A price, however, has been paid for these remarkable achievements. In the positive rush to integrate our schools and open the doors of education to our handicapped, our minorities and disadvantaged, our young and old, we have stretched ourselves a bit thin. We have temporarily lost sight of the dual responsibility of our educational system, which is not only to provide access to educational opportunities for all of our people, but to also instill in each person the desire to pursue excellence in whatever field of human endeavor they choose, and to provide the teachers, programs, and funds which will both create the desire and make the pursuit attainable.

Quality and diversity of opportunity as well as access is what we seek. However, as Harold Taylor commented at the conference, "The educational system has shifted slightly, but the shifts have been mainly backwards in the last two or three years, in that with the difficulties experienced by the economy and a loss of nerve exhibited by educators, we have become, to some extent, despondent as a country about our own educational system."

It is a time of re-groupment, of re-analyzing priorities, of re-evaluating beliefs. In the interim it seems that we've got our people into the system, now what do we teach them? An answer increasingly being heard across the land, brought on by falling test scores, failed bond issues, and a worsening economic situation, is to "Go Back to the Basics."

The implications of this rallying cry were of great concern to the participants at the conference. For in practice, back to basics often translates into an abrupt slash and cut raid on existing art in education programs and a moratorium on the development of any new programs, especially for that expendable minority of gifted and talented students who, because of their innate abilities, can "make it on their own," despite extensive evidence to the contrary.

This complicated issue, like others facing the arts and the gifted, has appeared for a number of interrelated reasons. It is due, in part, to changing economic conditions, in part to the stresses placed on our educational institutions by the increased populations they must serve, and in part to the extensive educational experimentation which began in the 1960's.

The economic considerations are obviously causing a re-evaluation of what progams we will put our limited educational dollars into. This in turn raises pragmatic and philosophical questions as to what we, as a people, believe is central to a quality education for our citizens. There are often strong lines drawn here as each institution and each individual sets up their own lists of priorities. The related questions seeking to relieve the stresses placed on our educational facilities by increased access are equally convoluted, and like most issues involving education, must weave their way through social and political realities as well as deal with more pragmatic economic concerns.

In the case of the widespread experimental programs begun in the 1960's, many of these programs were fruitful and much needed; others, created in enthusiasm and hope, ended in contributing to our present problems rather

than ameliorating them. Unfortunately, these mistakes have been used at times not to indict any individual program, but the experimental, creative process itself, and through extension, the value of the arts to education. Their role is interpreted, however erroneously, as neither central nor vital. They are viewed, as John D. Rockefeller III once said, as "a kind of garnish, easily set aside, like parsley." One of the results of this type of thinking is that individuals both within and outside our educational system believe that the road out of this tangled web begins with the elimination of, or cutting back on programs for the arts and the gifted in education.

While there was much concern expressed and eloquent statements made at the conference over the "Back to Basics" movement and its implications for the arts and the gifted, there was also the understanding that at least the arts in education are no longer starting from square one. Since the mid-60's there has been some epic legislation passed and programs initiated which have dramatically affected the course of the arts in education. The results of these Federal and state actions have improved the picture both for the arts in education and art programs for the gifted and talented.

It was also in 1965 that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was created, which initiated for the first time in Federal education legislation a direct linkage between the arts and education. It has been estimated that from 1966-1970, Title I ESEA funding for cultural programs totaled $267 million, while Title III funded $80 million for projects concerned with the arts. "Certainly," said Junius Eddy of the Rockefeller Foundation, in a 1974 report called "Perspectives on the Arts and General Education", "it would have been difficult in 1960 (or even in 1964) to find anyone who would have believed that funds on the order of $367 million (from any source) would have been spent on pre-collegiate programs dealing with the arts by the end of that period."

In 1965 the Office of Education's Arts and Humanities program was initiated. This program, said Eddy, "represented a new awareness on the part of the Federal education agency that the arts and humanities - previously categorically excluded from vitually every piece of Federal school legislation - were an important, though long neglected, aspect of education." In the beginning, the prime concern of this program was to administer ESEA Title IV funds for research and development in arts education. During the first four years of operation, research and development funds for pre-college educational programs averaged between $70 and $75 million per year. In 1972 the National Institute of Education assumed responsibility for arts research. Currently, the Office of Education's Arts and Humanities Program staff is working with the Alliance for Arts Education in administrating the Arts in Education Program.

The late 1960's also saw the creation of the Artist-in-Schools program, a co-operative effort of the Arts Endowment and the Office of Education. The program is presently supported by the Arts Endowment, with occasional additional funds allocated by the Office of Education. Under this program, professional artists are brought into our elementary and secondary schools to demonstrate their skills and familiarize the students with the wide variety of expression found within the arts. The 1976 budget for the program was approximately $4 million, with over two thousand artists working in 7,500 schools.

In the 1970's, three organizations have been established which have a

bearing on the continued development of art in education. The first, the National Institute of Education, was created in 1972. It is responsible for funding all educational research and development, including arts education research, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1976, approximately $1.5 million, out of a total budget of $70 million was allocated for arts education. These figures indicate that while art education research is important to the NIE, arts research does take low priority among the research needs identified by the Institute, such as reading and career education.

The second organization, the Alliance for Arts Education, was established in 1973 by the Office of Education and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The AAE acts as the Center's education program. In the last few years it has produced offspring: state AAE committees which are seeking to create a grass roots movement for the arts in education. In cooperation with O.E.'s Arts and Humanities Program, the AAE is coordinating and implementing the Arts in Education Program. The program's first year budget (1976) was $750,000, allocated to state and local educational agencies "to establish and conduct programs in which the arts are an integral part of elementary and secondary school programs" (Education Amendments of 1974, PL 93-380).

While the funds earmarked for these programs were certainly not earth shaking, the idea behind the grants produced tremendous response. As Kathryn Bloom said in "Coming to our Senses", "The amount of money is not large, but the fact that there are funds to initiate plans has had an electrifying effect on the school systems and state departments nationally. In fact, I think that the combination of a model or a demonstration that works, along with money to make some grants, has created much more quickly than any of us would expect something which really is a national movement for the arts in education in the schools."

The third organization, the Office of Gifted and Talented, was established in 1973 within the U.S. Office of Education. For the first time, a U.S.O.E. office was designated to operate in an advocacy capacity for the interests of the gifted. "The strategy that we have employed is to work with state departments of education because states are responsible for free public education," said Jane Case Williams, Office of Gifted and Talented, at the 1974 Spearfish conference.

In total, there are seven major programs, as well as a few minor ones, presently being supported by the Federal government. "There are two other programs," as indicated in "Coming to our Senses", "with the primary purpose of supporting arts education projects, though this purpose is not officially mandated by legislation: the Special Arts Project of the Office of Education, which operates under the Emergency School Aid Act, and the Education Program for the National Endowment for the Arts. The former, begun in 1974, funds projects which help children develop appreciation for art and for their own creative abilities through direct contact with artists from various art disciplines and various racial and ethnic backgrounds."

In addition to these major Federal programs there are a number of other sources for funding and program assistance in the arts scattered throughout the Federal government: The Division of Education Programs of the Humanities Endowment, the Educational Innovation and Support Program of the U.S. Office of Education's Bureau of School Systems, and the Educational Research and Development Program of the National Institute of Education.

While all of these programs indicate the growing role the Federal government is playing in furthering the arts in education, the increased variety of programming sources has led to its own set of problems, such as duplication of efforts and lack of coordination between agencies. At present, there are two organizations responsible for coordinating the government's efforts in art education: the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, which works with NEA and NEH and nine other agencies involved with the arts and humanities, and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, composed of representatives from thirty Federal agencies involved in education. While progress has been made, there are still large problems to be solved in delineating responsiblities and relationships between agencies. In addition, although the Federal government has increased its role in influencing the course of art in education, much of the authority for change still rests with the state and local agencies.

Besides these Federal efforts there has also been some forward progress on the state and local level. Attitudes have changed, even dramatically, in some states regarding the role of the arts in education. As Harold Taylor pointed out at the conference, "the state of North Carolina supports a school of the arts for young people from the ages of fourteen up to twenty-two, some of whom are college students. Around five hundred in number, with fifty to sixty students from the state of North Carolina, the rest from all around the country. An extraordinary place which can act as a model for other institutional arrangements we could put into every state in the Union."

North Carolina does not stand alone. For instance, there is also the High School of Performing Arts in New York City (1949), the Duke Ellington High School and the Western High School of Performing Arts (1974), both in Washington D.C., and the Houston, Texas, High School for the Performing and Visual Arts (1971). On a smaller scale, Teaneck High School, in New Jersey, operates independent study programs for gifted students. The Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Nassau County, New York, operates a Cultural Arts Center for talented high school students. Serving forty-four school districts, the Cultural Arts Center offers intensive programs in the arts not available to students within their own school district.

There are also a number of other, smaller programs being created across the country. Fargo, North Dakota, for instance, used funds from an ESEA Title III grant to provide extended learning experiences in the arts for forty gifted high school students. The community provided the tutors - local artists and musicians - and classes were held in Fargo's Creative Arts Center. The program is presently being expanded to include dance and drama students.

These are heartening examples and models of what can be accomplished in creating programs for the arts and the gifted. But presently each of these exciting programs stands like an isolated jewel. When and how will the setting be completed? There are approximately 24,000 high schools in America and some 14 million secondary students, of which 1.5 to 2.5 million are gifted and talented. How many are presently being reached? It is estimated that some 11 million students may still have had no exposure to art opportunities within our secondary school system. That is a staggering number. A figure which reflects the distance we have yet to travel on this journey to integrate the arts in education.

But surely the picture must be better within our institutions of higher learning? A few more statistics. Of the 3,055 two and four year colleges and universities in America (as of 1976), 63% do not offer a major in art, and only 1,214 offer even a single art course. More importantly, only 233 institutions offer a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, only 130 bestow a Master of Fine Arts degree, and fewer than a baker's dozen offer graduate programs in gifted and talented education. While statistics certainly do not tell the whole story, they do provide a sobering barometer by which to measure the level of importance our institutions presently place on the centrality of the arts in education. "In the meantime," as Harold Taylor said at the conference:

> "Outside the education system all kinds of great things have been happening. We've never had in the history of civilization a country in which so many varieties of new forms of art are occurring, no culture where there's been so many participants in the art forms themselves, no age in the history of any country where so much attention has been paid, by the public, to a variety of art form. We have an incredible amount of action in the field of dance and in theatres across the country...We are now in the middle of an extraordinary expansion of public interest in all forms of art; and the irony is that just at this point when so many young people are feeling an identity with the artist as a person, a sense of comradeship in the aesthetic community of the country and the world--and wished to pledge his or her allegiance to the art forms ranging from music, to theatre, to dance, to sculpture, to photography, to film making; they are being frustrated by a lack of opportunity in our schools."

So where does this leave us? As the participants at the conference recognized, there has been some definite movement forward in integrating the arts in education, in developing and initiating new programs for the gifted and talented (such as North Carolina's School for the Arts), and in developing and integrating community art resources with the school system. There was also the realization, however, that this movement forward has been largely sporadic and fragmented, too often low in priority and lacking in coherent policy directives from Federal or state agencies, and has not been met with equal progress in the more specialized category of advanced art opportunities for the gifted and talented.

Given this situation, what then is the present reality of art programs in our school system? "Today," as Gene Wenner, Arts Education Co-ordinator, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., said, "a paradox exists." In relating material from a policy paper being prepared for the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, he went on to say:

> "On the one hand never have there been more exciting partnerships betwen the arts and education. Teachers in traditional disciplines are learning from their art educator collegues about ways to use the arts in their classrooms; schools are developing creative new relationships with community arts resources: theatres, museums, dance groups, poets, artists, musicians, etc.; state departments of education and state arts

and humanities councils have taken leadership in directing discretionary funds toward the arts in education; and federal programs have contributed seed money to show that the arts in education can strengthen and invigorate one another.

"On the other hand, the art budget may be the weakest line on on the school district ledger sheet. Many teachers perceive the arts as a threat; many schools stand isolated from the communities around them; many art professionals are wary of building any lasting bridges to that forbidding entity called 'the school.' Many state depatments isolate efforts of educators and art advocates; and Federal art programs are isolated and fragmented both within and across agencies, and lack a clear definition of their separate and collective responsibilities."

So here we stand, with our feet firmly planted on two sides of an educational chasm. All around us rise up voices telling us to first jump one way, then another, when really what we need to do is build a bridge and shed light into those recesses of doubt and misinformation which perpetuate the belief that the arts, somehow, are not integral to the advancement of our educational system and, ultimately, our society. For the conference participants, the task at hand was to develop those positive policy recommendations which will help to bring forth the talent, the motivation, the initiative, and the creativity needed to bridge, and eventually close, the divide between the arts and education.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

by Edward Larsh

For the participants who journeyed to Aspen for the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted, the issues at hand were not so much concerned with: "Where do we begin?" as "Where do we go from here?"..."How do we maintain what has been so hard gained?"...and, "What recommendations can we make to integrate the arts for the gifted across our educational system?"

In the daily presentations, workshops, and gatherings of small groups of participants these questions appeared over and over again in different forms. There was often both an air of hope as well as frustration, of high expectations tempered by the reality of experience, of known progress forward measured against the realization of the long road ahead.

There was a diversity of talent and experience at Aspen. People from many states and geographical regions, from many art disciplines and levels within the institutional life of the arts in America. The resulting mix produced its own chemistry and flavor. This diversity of talent and experience also produced a diversity of viewpoints, so that, as one participant said, "We had focused on the problems...the variety of interests represented by the institutional life of the country."

Underlying each opinion was the shared belief in the value of the arts to our educational system and to our society. As Harold Taylor said, "These were people who had come to an appreciation of the arts, just as they came to this conference, because of a commitment to a life which includes aesthetic experiences as a component and an essential part of life." And the conference offered them the kind of stage for the co-mingling of experiences and the interrelating of knowledge which produces a community of thought. A will of the whole which expressed at Aspen a strong sense of the policies our instituitons need to initiate. Policies which will provide our gifted with the kinds of educational experiences they need to pursue and attain excellence.

In the course of developing these policy recommendations, a number of phrases and key words appeared which spelled out the directions of inquiry the participants pursued: "There is a lack of public awareness"..."No national policy, no related national curriculum"..."The arts need to be made a priority"..."funds are insufficient"..."Federal programs are isolated and fragmented"..."improve teacher training"..."expand teacher certification"..."concerned with excellence"..."relationships between the artist and arts educator"..."a need to develop model programs"..."elitism" ..."problem of identification"..."career education"..."lack of cooperation between communities, schools, and the government"..."compile resource materials"... "back to basics."

None of these concerns and issues were new to the participants. They had been dealing with these problems from both within and outside our educational system for many years. And little had appeared to change since the 1971 report to Congress by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, entitled, "Education of the Gifted and Talented", which pointed out that:

Large-scale studies indicate that gifted and talented children are, in fact, disadvantaged and handicapped in the usual school situation.

A conservative estimate of gifted and talented children ranges between 1.5 and 2.5 million.

Over half of a representative sample of schools in the United States reported no gifted students in their schools. The statement may be ascribed to apathy or hostility, but not to fact.

Research studies on special needs of the gifted and talented demonstrate the need for special programs. Contrary to widespread belief, these students cannot ordinarily excel without assistance.

Conventional or standardized curriculum requirements were seen as unimportant to the gifted and talented. Rather than studying grade level content required of the total group, an open curriculum based on individual interests was favored, with large blocks of independent time. The gifted and talented were seen as capable of self-management and decision-making for both content of study and classroom procedures.

The problems of screening and identification are complicated by assumptions that talents cannot be found as abundantly in certain groups as in others, with the emphasis heavily in favor of the affluent.

These assumptions may have influenced meager search and identification among other groups. There is ample evidence that highly gifted children can be identified in all groups within our society.

Studies have shown that pupil personnel workers are indifferent or hostile in their attitudes towards the gifted.

The United States has been inconsistent in seeking out the gifted and talented, finding them early in their lives, and individualizing their education.

It has been eight years since the publication of that report. It has been five years since the National Conference on the Arts and Humanities/Gifted and Talented, held in Spearfish, South Dakota. And it has been seven years since the establishment of the Office of Gifted and Talented within the U.S. Office of Education. And while progress has been made through the efforts of these and other conferences, reports, and government agencies, there is still much in those findings which remains a reality in the schools of America. The findings and recommendations of the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted pointed out that this is a growing area of concern and interest within the department of education.

The Federal government, as each participant was aware, cannot act unilaterally in providing increased opportunities for our gifted and talented. It can provide leadership, policy initiatives, programs, funds and resources, but it cannot realistically function as an agent for change without the cooperation and support of the state and local agencies. As Gene Wenner said, "The control of education has always been by the local

board in most areas...the financial support of education has always been local...(and) the states have the legal responsiblity for education."

These facts have often been misunderstood or misinterpreted by people who believe that the creation of a Federal office, such as the Office of Gifted and Talented, or the development of Federal programs and funds for arts projects, insures that action or a "change for the better" will occur. This is simply not so. Each element within the picture has its own priorities and beliefs, backed by varying levels of responsibility and authority, to implement its convictions. While the relationship between the government and state and local agencies is often cooperative, with each segment concerned with achieving common goals, at other times it resembles more of an adversary relationship. And in the case of the arts and the gifted, in the past continuing through the present, there has often been a divergence, not a convergence, of convictions at all levels as to what is essential to meeting the educational needs of all of our citizens.

The real control of education then, including arts education, rests at the state and local level. The drive to integrate the arts in America, in education, and develop programs for the gifted, however, is largely the product of Federal, rather than state-local initiatives. Originally, what activity there was along these lines on the state-local level was sporadic and limited in scope. This is changing. There are now state art councils in all of the states and approximately 2,000 community art councils, some of which are working towards developing art programs and lines of communication and cooperation with their local school districts.

If change is to be made for the arts in education, this is one of the linkages which needs to be nurtured and supported. Community art councils, community resources, and local artists provide a vital source of talent, inspiration, programs, and information which can be utilized for the effective development of artistic capabilities within our gifted and talented citizens. For if the arts are to become an integral part of education and community life, the value of the arts must become a community belief, held in common by the local educators and teachers as well as by the community at large.

This felt need must originate from the bottom of the system up, as well as from the top down. As Jack Faxon, State Senator from Michigan, said at the conference, "The whole problem is that education is very much a grass roots process. It's not a national thing; it has to be effective at the local level and the state level. The Federal government is not going to run education...they're not going to provide the direct, pupil contact experience that's so important at the local level. I think that educators have to see themselves as being more than just educators. They have to be civic minded persons who serve as a focal point in their community for addressing the problems of education, and seeing to it that the arts are an integral part of that process."

The problems that exist in developing state and local support for the arts in education and programs for the gifted are many. There is often a lack of awareness on the part of the public and local institutions as to the nature of the problems and to what courses of action can be initiated to meet the needs of the gifted. There is also a difficulty in determining what resources are available for the arts and the gifted. This lack of awareness and resource knowledge extends both across and within agencies, from the local to the Federal level. It is often a case of the left hand not knowing

what the right is doing. This is due, in part, to the increasing complexity of the arts in America and in education, and to the increasing complexity of the organizations which are attempting to address the problems.

In the case of the growing number of local art councils, for example, they are often faced with a variety of tasks in a given community. Some respond by trying to do a little bit of everything, others concentrate in certain areas. One result is that there is not always a consistancy between what members of the councils perceive to be the principal needs in their communities, and what their councils actually do.

Speaking to this problem at the conference, Michael Newton, former President of the American Councils of the Arts, said:

> "I had a striking example of this in a small community in Mississippi last year. When I went to this city to attend a function, I arrived in town and somebody said the function doesn't start for an hour, and in the meantime would I speak to the art council. I said, 'Yes,' and came into a room and there was the art council sitting on the edge of their chairs waiting to hear what they ought to do. Faced with this challenge, not being quite prepared, I said, 'Let us go through an exercise in which half the group will figure out what the council now does, and the other half, in another room, will figure out what the priorities are in the commmunity.' They came back one hour later and reported. The one group said, 'The greatest need in this community is to strengthen the offerings in the arts in our schools.' The other group said, 'What we are doing as a program is representing an increasing number of arts events to the people of this community as a whole.' 'What are you doing in the field of education?' I said. 'Nothing,' they said."

Lack of awareness and failure of inter-agency communication often produces a lack of properly directed initiatives, even within a community wherein lies, at least, the spirit to improve the situation of the arts in education. This lack of awareness extends beyond any individual community, beyond the local educational institutions, past the state level, and on into the Federal government. Along each step of the ladder this issue is compounded by other problems, many of which stem, however, from this basic lack of awareness as to the priority role the arts play in education. As Michael Newton commented, "...the last lesson which I have learned in these last twenty years comes back to a principal point...that is a profound conviction that the arts will only make it in our society - and by make it I mean we'll only move the arts up as a priority in our society - if they break out from a small circle of those whose primary concern is with the arts, to work with others in our society who have goals which are not inconsistant with the arts."

The problems surrounding awareness and priorities were of great concern to the conference participants. They were aware that lack of awareness often produces apathy and insensitivity as well as well meaning but erroneous beliefs. A climate which is not conducive to increasing the priority role of the arts in education. As Gene Wenner said:

"We've developed a problem with the arts which is that they have become, by and large, isolated from the general major concerns of education. They're nice to have around when you have the time and the money, but they're not really central to the education of all children. So the problem then becomes one of how can this juxaposition of the arts for a small number of children begin to impact on the totality of education. We're finding out answers to that. We're finding to not throw out all the art and music programs, but to build upon their strength, develop new programs in which they begin to relate to the total concerns of education. There's a long way to go in terms of this type of isolation, because basically what we're dealing with is not policy, not legislation, not high handed notions about how wonderful the arts are, it is basically a day to day traditional exclusion or non-thinking about the arts as being included in education. And that's harder to change."

For the conference participants, the arts in education are not just viewed as ends in themselves or as programs which solely benefit the artistically capable. The arts celebrate life and humanity and their effect on learning crosses all educational boundaries and touches all people. The arts are a springboard to all learning. The arts, indeed, are basic to education and are valuable tools for inculcating interest in, and mastery of, other educational skills. As Kathryn Bloom, Director, Arts Education Program for the John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund, said, "We've discovered in these (art) programs that are in school systems that if you can motivate youngsters by giving them a reason to read, or to write, or to use arithmetic that they are much more activated, so the arts are being discovered as a very valuable tool in motivating youngsters in changing their attitudes toward learning, and we're finding that achievement scores and basic skills are not going down. If anything, they're going up."

An increased awareness of the role the arts play in education was also brought up by Edwin Martin, Deputy Commissioner, Education of the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education. In commenting on the role of the U.S. Office of Education in this area he said, "We've tried to make the arts a priority in our order of activities in the Office of Education...We searched out ways to expand the concepts of equity to include concepts of excellence as well...(as Carl Jung pointed out) there must be a balancing between cognition and feeling, between the intellect and the arts...it is necessary if we are to create whole human beings out of our education system."

This increasing awareness as to the role the arts have played in education and should play in the future has raised new priority considerations as well as realigned old priority ideas. As Edwin Martin said, "as we've worked on programs for gifted and talented youngsters we've seen that traditionally they've emphasized only the academically bright youngsters, and have not looked into youngsters who have talents in the arts. This is where we'd like to go next. We'd like to broaden our emphasis on children who have unusual abilities in the arts and to stimulate the schools to meet their needs."

On the other side of the coin, as one participant said, "(I'm) concerned for what the arts have to do with the needs of academically gifted children. What kinds of programs are we providing for those children who have cognitive and academic ability, because most of the time they are encouraged to do

more geometry, more calculus, more advanced this and that, and are hardly viewed in terms of their involvement and relationship to the arts." If we are to "create whole human beings out of our educational system," as Edwin Martin said, there is a need to provide learning experiences in the arts for both kinds of gifted and talented individuals, as well as for all people who can benefit from art experiences through education.

Another problem which increased awareness at the Federal level has brought to light is the past role of the private, professional artist within the school system. We are learning from the Artists-in-Schools Program and other efforts to involve community artists with education. One of the things we've learned, as Gene Wenner said:

> "There used to be a generally going assumption that those who can't do art, teach it. That's the first part of the assumption, but it gets worse. Therefore, those who do art, teach it better than anyone else. Therefore, the solution to the problem of arts education is to put artists into the schools. There may be some truth to that linkage of thoughts and assumptions, but I think in the way the Artists-in-Schools Programs have worked, that most people would admit that the best artist in the world becomes, at times, a crusader in an often hostile land; and not only doesn't he or she do better arts education, but often alienates a school system to the point where they say, 'See, I told you the arts shouldn't be part of the education of children.' However, I do believe we're making a lot of progress in this area. As just one example, I would like to share with you some recently adopted national guidelines of the Artists-in-Schools Program, which is administered through state art councils. They have come up with three goals, which will show you we're starting along the road to breaking down some of these barriers and traditional concepts. The first goal is to 'demonstrate the value of using high quality professional artists in educational settings.' That's approximately where the program existed before. The second goal, however, says, 'to encourage cooperative planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs among artists, art agencies, arts educators, and education agencies to strengthen the arts in education.' Now, that is a totally different approach. It begins to say that the end goal is not just artists. The end goal is truly strengthening the arts in education program. To go a step further, the third goal is 'to encourage the development of a broad base of support, financial and otherwise, for arts programs which address the educational needs of schools in their communities.' Progress is being made."

Progress has been made because we're willing to learn from our mistakes, and we're developing, abeit slowly, more effective linkages and communications between agencies. Yet, it has not been easy. For instance, since its creation in 1965, one of the stellar lights of arts education has been the National Endowment for the Arts. Yet, it too, like organizations and institutions all the way up and down the ladder, has not been thoroughly aware of the issues concerning the arts and the gifted. As we mentioned at the conference, the Arts Endowment is presently undergoing a review of a number of policies and programs which affect art in education. As Joe Prince, Special Assistant to the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, said:

"Panelists and staff at the Endowment are generally concerned that the gifted and the talented young people of this nation may be wasted. And while much of the Endowment's thrust in the past has been directed toward the older, more mature artist, there is indeed a recognition of the need to become a partner in discovery and development of the young of our nation. The time has come for the National Endowment for the Arts to be a positive influence on the educational scene whether it be through advocacy or through financing or both. And to the extent that the Endowment has addressed educational issues in the past, it has done so without sufficient comprehensive purpose and without enough consultation with educators."

These are signs of improvement, but as yet they are still just signs and do not manifest a broad movement across all educational fronts, at all levels, to improve the picture of arts in education programs for the gifted. Balanced against this forward movement is the current trend towards Back to Basics programs which stress the development of cognitive skills at the expense of artistic capabilities. One of the most formidable tasks faced by individuals involved in arts education is creating the climate, through increased awareness, that the arts are as basic to learning as writing and mathmatical skills.

Related to the problems of awareness and priorities is access to resource materials. Information is uncodified and unevenly distributed. At every level there is no comprehensive approach to distributing material, of any nature, to those interested in the subject of arts education, let alone to those who are unfamiliar with the subject or rank it low in priority. If priorities and awareness levels are to change an educational process must occur; and adequate, accessible resource data can play an important part in effecting that change. It is also important to supply the various institutions and community organizations involved in arts education with access to complete resource materials, in order that they can increase the successfulness of existing programs as well as design new, more effective, models.

These three issues--awareness, priorities, and resources--affect not only the course of art education, but the course of our entire educational system. They are primary issues to be addressed and understood if we are to move our entire system forward, for the arts affect not only what we learn, but the manner in which we learn it. One of the basic problems in art education has simply been a failure to communicate adequately enough and convincingly enough to those who need to be convinced, that the arts are basic to education, for the gifted and talented as well as all students.

In order to aid in developing this communication need, the conference reported out two recommendations which will aid in the development of policies to increase awareness and the priority role of gifted and talented in education--at all levels--and to make common the knowledge of the various resources available for arts and gifted programs.

FINDING: There is insufficient national public awareness of and priority for the needs of the gifted and the arts and for the development of potential abilities in the arts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Establishment of the arts as a top priority area for gifted and talented in the Office of Gifted and Talented as well as in other agency programs, such as Career Education, etc.

- Interagency liaison among the various national agencies and organizations whose activities and interests involve the arts and the gifted. This should extend through state and local levels.

- Expansion of the Presidential Scholars Program to include scholars in the arts or establishment of a separate program of awards to give national recognition to young persons of achievement in the visual or performing arts.

- Hold annual national and regional conferences to encourage the priority of the arts and the gifted, for sharing of ideas, media and materials.

FINDING: At all levels, national, state, and community, there is difficulty in determining the nature of resources which may be available to the arts and the gifted.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A national compilation should be made which identifies the various types of resources available for public and private sources.

- Guidelines should be published which will assist states and localities in access to such resources.

One of the problems facing the arts and the gifted is the question of "elitism" - the creation and promotion of a favored minority of people at the expense of the majority. There are, unfortunately, many people in both the public and private sectors who believe that the development of special programs for the gifted is elitist. There are two main currents of concern. On the one hand, there is the belief that the creation of special programs is somehow "undemocratic," and runs against the educational principle of equal access and equal opportunities for all. On the other hand, there is the apprenhension that special programs for the gifted will result in producing a group of people who will feel and act somehow superior, an "aristocracy", which through some osmosis process will come to dominate their peers in a school setting.

Is this an issue based on the reality of experience? In the 1974 report, "The Arts and the Gifted," from the proceedings of the National Conference on Arts and Humanities/Gifted and Talented, held at Spearfish, South Dakota, it reported that, "The evidence shows that gifted young people are most apt to suffer from the opposite of a feeling of smug superiority." "The fact is," said Harold Lyon, "that feelings of inferiority are much more commonly found among the bright and talented than among the average, perhaps because the latter are not as keenly aware of how much there is to know." The 1971 report to Congress, "Education of the Gifted and Talented," in commenting on this issue said:

"The relatively few gifted students who have had the advantage of special programs have shown remarkable improvements in self-understanding and in ability to relate well to others, as well as in improved academic and creative performance. The programs have not produced arrogant, selfish snobs; special programs have extended a sense of reality, wholesome humility, self-respect, and respect for others...Apparently the burden of the majority is to create conditions which will lessen feelings of alienation, and allow the gifted and talented to feel that they are valued members of the human race, whatever the circumstances of background."

The questions surrounding elitism, especially within the context of concentrating our educational energies on the development of general arts programs versus art programs for the gifted, continued to be an issue of valid concern for the participants at the Aspen conference. Should we concentrate our priorities on developing arts in education opportunities for all students, or on the development of special programs for the gifted? Or can we do both? The questions are both simplified and complicated by the close relationship that exists between general programs for all specific programs for the gifted and talented. Is it possible or necessary to do both? For the conference participants the answer was yes, because of the need to integrate the arts in our society for the benefit of all of our citizens, and because of the need to develop the special artistic potential of our gifted, for them as well as for our society.

Yet, even for the conference participants this is a question which still needs to be examined closely. As Arts Coordinator Gene Wenner said, "We have an apparent danger here that we have to be aware of. Gifted and talented concerns need to a part of a much broader and comprehensive approach to the arts that are for all students and have a variety of dimensions." And Harold Taylor, commenting on the question, mentioned, "We do not wish to recommend policies which would segregate into an elite the gifted and talented at the expense of the other ones whose talents lie just beneath the surface of their public character. The young person who doesn't know he or she has talent is a very important element in our culture. We must avoid the notion that there are some endowed with gifts and others who don't possess them. Now I'm over simplifying but this is an issue and we have to be very careful how we handle it."

Murry Sidlin, Conductor for the New Haven Symphony Orchestra, in discussing one of the problems faced by the arts as a direct result of the Back to Basics movement, made a comment of elitism and general art programs versus programs for the gifted. He said:

"Now at this point, someone always throws in the either/or argument...Yet no one ever says CIA or Pentagon, Army or Navy, NASA or NIH, Yankees or Mets, Baretta or Kojack. Is the real question one of finances? If this were a program of math or science in 1956 under Eisenhower, would anyone ask that question - wouldn't the funding somehow turn up as it did?...Well, this is a program of life, of art, of beauty, of aesthetics, feelings, thinking, knowing, understanding, wishing, wondering, fantasizing, doing...The question is not one of funding but one of priorities. What do we consider important enough for our dedication, our commitment, and only then the implementation which includes funding and budget."

The ironic part is that we are presently accomplishing both goals in our educational system in the area of developing cognitive skills. General programs in math and science backed by advanced courses in calculus and chemistry. Special awards for the academically gifted, such as those presented through the Presidential Scholars Program. State and national science fairs which highlight and promote our gifted and talented academic youth. And, probably most ironic of all, the special programs in the area of physical education which have been fantastically successful in promoting and developing specific athletic skills within a minority group of America's youth. Yet, many people in our society still view the same course of action for the arts as being somehow undemocratic, promoting the few at the expense of the many.

In responding to this question, the 1971 report to Congress, "Education of the Gifted and Talented," said:

> "Aren't special provisions undemocratic? If democratic educational practice is interpreted as the same education for all, the answer is yes. If we believe that democratic education means appropriate educational opportunities and the right to education in keeping with one's ability to benefit, the answer is no. If one takes the affirmative stand, then all special educational programs would disappear, and hundreds of millions now expended by the state and the Federal government would be diverted to other uses...Rather than argue that special planning is undemocratic, one might concude that the special planning should be carried on for the benefit of the democracy."

There were few, if any, at the conference who would disagree with this assessment of the issue. There is an unqualified need to develop specialized programs for the artistically gifted. We have an obligation - to the gifted, ourselves, and society - to insure that the creative talents of our people are not wasted, for often the gifted are the ones who show us new dimensions of human spirit and thought. These individuals shoud be recognized early in life and given support. Programs should be developed which enable the gifted to interact with art teachers, professional artists and their own peers. Presently, the gifted are not only often shut out from the schools of America, but also from contact with other individuals within their own age groups and from similiar cultural backgrounds. This peer group interaction is needed to provide both support and stimulation of creative thought. They need to be integrated, not segregated, from each other and society.

But where do we find these gifted and talented people? Surely, if one has innate gifts and talents, they should manifest themselves in some obvious way for all to see. Surely, they should "win out" over all adversity. Surely, parents and educators and teachers must be able to spot with ease the spark of creative energy which lies just beneath the surface of a talented individual. Surely, the testing procedures so prevalent in our schools today must immediately recognize a person with artistic gifts and talents. And even if passed over in the usual setting, surely at some time in life the special qualities of a gifted person must rise to the surface for all to see, as in the case of a Grandma Moses or the Blues singer, Leadbelly.

As the conference participants were well aware, none of these suppositions is true. At present, there is an extreme difficulty in identifying

young people with a high potential in the arts. What if a gifted person lives in a ghetto, or on an Indian reservation, or doesn't speak English? What if a gifted person, from any socio-economic background, has no access to artistic expression at home or through programs in the school? What happens when parents and teachers are untrained in recognizing exceptional skills in the arts? What information can be obtained from testing procedures which stress verbal, academic abilities, rather than expressive abilities, especially non-verbal skills? What happens when there is apathy or hostility within a community or within an individual parent or teacher towards those who seem somehow different or "too smart for their own good?" What happens to a person with gifts, but with low-motivation, or an individual whose abilities in art lie in another field than the courses which are offered in our schools today? What happens when a young person, or a person of any age, doesn't recognize that he or she has a special talent, a gift? Where and to whom do they turn when there is neither the interest or means within the school system or the community to help them understand and realize their potential?

These are pressing problems. At present, we do not have codified, credible means for identifying the gifted. Many parents and teachers who could be helpful in alleviating this problem lack adequate information and training because their is no general body of knowledge, no guidelines, which could be dissiminated to school systems across the country. This breeds apathy as well as stifles initiative. And lack of awareness and information produces another by-product, ignorance. For many young people, especially the poor and the culturally different, are overlooked simply because no one knew what to look for. And even when tested within a general school setting, many of the gifted - from all socio-economic backgrounds - fail to be recognized because of appropriately designed testing procedures We need, as Harold Taylor said:

> "To arrange for a serious study of the effect of the national testing movement on the discovery of talent in the arts. If you look at the testing movement as it now operates, it doesn't search out talent of a creative or intuitive sort...we find that the talents of the gifted in the arts are being ignored. There is nothing, for example, to test for divergent rather than convergent thinking. There is nothing to test for the indications of imaginative energy lying concealed in the student body of America...(we need) to take a good hard look at the inhibition produced by the testing movement on the discovery of talent and on the role of art in the curriculum itself. Since teachers do teach to the tests and exams, therefore, the content of the test determines the content of the curriculum and we have a circular effect of a negative sort in dealing with the arts... Among other things this has meant that almost no attention has been paid to the qualifications for admission to college of those whose talents and gifts do not lie entirely within the academic examination system and whose qualifications are predominnately, and sometimes extraordinarily, developed in the field of the creative arts."

While there are methods presently being used to locate gifted children - art competitions, auditions, teacher and parent nomination, peer judgement, professional talent evaluation, some tests, etc. - these are not carried out under any organized, national plan. In addition, each of these methods has been generally found to have only partial reliability, and few school systems employ a combination of techniques which would increase the

effectiveness of the screening process. In particular, "the means must be found," as it said in the recommendations from the National Task Force on the Arts and the Gifted, "for recognizing talent in areas other than those which are most obvious, and for developing the sensitivity to the divergent cultural contexts in which these talents may express themselves."

Tacked on to the problem of indentification is the problem of available programming for the gifted - once identified - with those learning experiences they need to realize their potential. Certainly, there are scattered across the country existing high schools for the arts and the gifted and other, individual programs for the arts in our schools. On the broad scale, however, these present programs stress art and music ability and overlook exceptional talent in other fields of art, such as dance, sculpture, film making, etc. In addition, these programs have often reached only those students already motivated and thus only a small percentage of students end up receiving opportunities in the arts. While this is changing, it still happens to be the status quo in our education system.

Based on this situation, two important conference findings and recommendations were:

FINDING: The identification of the young person with high potential in the arts is extremely difficult for the general educator. Codification of such procedures is very limited or non-existent.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Instruments or procedures for the identification of artistic talent should be developed, collected, evaluated, and disseminated.

- Guidelines for the nuturance of artistic potential among the young should be made available to parents and others.

FINDING: There is a paucity of information, curricula and program models available to general education teachers and programs for the gifted and the arts.

RECOMMENDATION:

- National service delivery and dissemination models should be developed with support from Federal sources. Assistance should be sought from private sector agencies and organizations with resources and expertise in the arts and the gifted.

- Existing curricula and program models should be collected and disseminated through organized channels. New models for education of the gifted in the arts should be developed and supported with reference to those which already exist.

Closely related to the problems of identification and program development is the issue of career education in the arts for the gifted and talented. Conference participants realized that career education in the arts

transcends the normal school environment. Doors must be opened to the community - to professional artists, art organizations, art centers, art councils, the total range of community resources - in order to provide students with the opportunities they need to examine and experience the stimulating and realistic aspects of the world of art that exist beyond the walls of the schoolhouse. As Dick Collins, Executive Director of the Denver Center for the Performing Arts said, "Do we turn students out from the schools and are they professionally trained? We came to the conclusion that no high school was going to turn out a professional student to go directly to the world of work...this is a massive problem which even goes in to such areas as the need to strengthen organizations which can take these people as they come out of school."

A unanimous finding of the workshop group on Career Education was that non-governmental as well as Federal and state career education programs need to be developed. In addition, as Dick Collins said, "there has to be a much closer relationship of all programs in the Office of Education. We cannot go on with the idea that there are different areas of the office which handle only a section of the problem. There has to be an understanding of the total problem, otherwise we'll never solve it."

The leadership provided under the Gifted and Talented Program in the Office of Education over the past five years and the response to these efforts on the part of many states and localities has been encouraging. And because of the promise of new legislation for both career education and for the gifted and talented, there is now a very real possibility for meaningful action programs. But the workshop group on Careers and the Arts expressed keen awareness of the difficulty of designing and implementing programs for the gifted in our elementary and secondary schools where arts programs are either minimal or non-existent for regular students.

Their recommendations took into account the need to push far beyond career information to comprehensive programs for career education. The effort must not be limited simply to facts about careers provided by guidance officers who may or may not be either knowledgeable about or particularly interested in the arts. Nor can it be limited to teachers in the arts struggling alone to meet the many needs of their students. In addition, career education should be understood within the context of all of education, including the vast possibilities in the adult world.

The conference finding on career education was:

> FINDING: The difficulties of designing and implementing programs of career education in the arts for gifted is hampered i, elementary and secondary schools where art programs are either minimal or non-existent for regular students. Further, comprehensive programs for career education must include all of the resources of the community and provide a realistic look at the wide range of possible careers in the arts. It is recognized that much education of gifted and talented artists does and must take place outside of the formal structure of the schools and colleges.
>
> RECOMMENDATIONS:
>
> - U.S.O.E. programs for career education and education for the

gifted should jointly examine instruments, procedures, and programs which may be available for career education in the arts and mount a program which catalogs such information and opportunities and makes it widely available to the public.

- U.S.O.E. should complement the work of the Task Force by convening arts educators, industry, business, labor, government and community leaders along with representatives from the art councils and successful artists to begin developing non-governmental programs aimed at tying the education of the gifted and talented in the arts to the arts themselves.

There was a uniformly held belief by the participants at Aspen that appreciation and access to the arts is not restricted to the young, to normal school years, or to the gifted and talented. In examing the needs of the gifted, "There was," as one participant said, "no implication that this meant anything less than full attention to the need to bring all the arts to all citizens. Special gifts and talents clearly need nurturing for their development, but so do the talents of those who have not yet discovered that they are gifted and talented, and all the others whose lives can be enriched by direct experience with the arts themselves, even though they may not become practicing artists."

The desire to "bring all the arts to all citizens" is not just a wish of those involved directly in arts education. It is a wish felt by a broad spectrum of Americans. We are aware of this because we have come to know much more than we did before about the arts and society. We've come to know more, because we've come to ask more. And in asking we've discovered that desire for the arts over the past twenty years has filtered into all levels of life in America. This fact was evidenced in the findings of a 197(?) Lou Harris poll on "Americans and the Arts." The study pointed out a number of things: that there is an enormous reservoir of interest in and good will towards the arts on the part of the American public; that the interest of Americans in the arts covers many areas - in being an audience for the arts, being participants in the arts, and being parents of children who have opportunities in the arts; that the American public felt that the arts have a role to play in contributing to a quality existence; that most Americans, especially parents, place a high priority on the development of art opportunities in their schools; and that most people who run arts organizations give a very high priority to the importance of the arts in education, and to the educational programs of their own institutions.

The findings of this study have surprised quite a number of people, including many individuals involved directly with the arts, who were unaware of the extent of interest in the arts felt by Americans. It appears a time delay has occurred between perceptions and reality. A time delay in which many Americans have gone around like walking islands, unaware that their own increased interest in and high expectations for the arts is shared by those around them.

Michael Newton pointed out this discrepancy between perceptions and reality at the conference. While discussing a recent gathering he had attend, he said:

"I had a meeting on Monday night with a group of mayors connected with the National League of Cities. One of them, Mayor Holland, the Mayor of Trenton, said to me, 'You know, I've always attended the New Jersey Symphony. I've always had season tickets, but since I've been Mayor I've really haven't had time to go. I decided it was a shame my tickets should go wasted and there should be two empty seats in the symphony each week during the season. I decided to give the tickets to somebody, and I thought about people who might benefit from them. I tried to think of people to whom it might represent some kind of financial sacrifice. So I called in a member of my road crew in the city, brought him into my office, and said, Joe, I would like to give you my season tickets to the New Jersey Symphony. And he replied, Mr. Mayor, why do I need your tickets, I have my own.'"

Amid a round of laughter and applause, Michael Newton finished the story by adding, "We have friends out there and we have allies, but they like we find it difficult to confer that general good will into effective change in our society."

The "Americans and the Arts" poll also pointed out another important discrepancy between perceptions and reality. That is, while there is strong grass roots support for the arts, Americans actually know very little about how the arts operate, how they are managed, and how they are financed. In the perception of the average American, the arts are paid for and run by a group of rich people. While this may be contrary to fact, in the public mind the arts either make money or break even.

These are important understandings to have of public attitudes. There is a strong desire felt by Americans for appreciating, experiencing, and participating in the arts. There is a desire to make the arts a normal part of daily life. There is a desire to give our children access to art opportunities through our schools. How then do we meet some of these felt needs through our educational system? In the context of Aspen, a number of solutions and recommendations were offered. Some of these, such as increasing the priority role of the arts in the U.S. Office of Education, increasing cooperation and linkages between agencies at all levels, developing model programs, codifying resources, increasing advocacy and funding for the arts, increasing awareness, etc., have already been mentioned.

John Everitt, Executive Director, Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, Oklahoma, in reporting the recommendations developed by the workshop on Community Resource Development for the Arts, indicated some additional conference findings and recommendations:

"A national public relations campaign should be launched for the arts and the gifted which would include a regularly published national communications vehicle as an instructional, informational, and public awareness tool. We would like to encourage states to establish community arts resource centers at the local level in a manner best suited to that local community - that would be permanently funded for staff and operations - and be capable of receiving program grants from all appropriate sources. This community arts resource center could be a division of the district school system or a regional community arts

castle or a special agency created for that purpose in the absence of a competent existing agency. That standardized simple paper work for funding and evaluation purposes be implemented and reduced to a minimum at U.S.O.E., commensurate with proper reporting to ensure all school districts easy access to available funds. That a national workshop and festival be held annually in varying locations to showcase outstanding programs to the nation via the media and to act as an inspirational and instructional tool for teachers, administrators, from educational and the arts, and the general public. And lastly, that support be given by the U.S.O.E. for the establishment of a national advocacy network to work with legislators, school boards, parents, corporate leaders, arts organizations, on behalf of a continuing program of Federal support for the arts in the educational systems of America."

The report from the workshop on Appreciation of the Arts, among other findings and recommendations, strongly urged the pursuit of two other courses of action:

1. In the long run, if the schools and colleges are to act as cultural centers through which the entire community is energized by the arts and the ideas of artists, writers and performers, the responsibility will rest in the hands of teachers and administrators who are themselves devoted to the arts and have had direct experience with them during the period of their own education. Members of the workshop, therfore, urge the radical reform of teacher education programs and curricula to provide student teachers and in-service teachers with opportunities for practicing the arts as an integral part of their preparation to become teachers.

2. Members of the workshop strongly approve in principle the idea that each city of medium size or larger should have at least one school of the arts as an integral part of the local public school system, to which students could apply on the basis of their talent in the arts and could study in a curriculum containing the regular academic subjects with a parallel curriculum in the creative arts. Approval was also expressed for the idea of state-wide schools of the arts using the model of the School of the Arts in North Carolina, as well as the Duke Ellington School of the Arts in Washington, D.C., which has gradually developed from a high school with a standard curriculum to one which contains a full complement of courses in the arts along with the more conventional program.

In addition to these ideas and recommendations generated by the conference participants, there were two other general conference findings:

FINDING: The appreciation of the arts and the ability for meaningful participation by the individual is not limited to early childhood or to the traditional school years.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Encourage programs of lifelong learning in the arts for persons of all ages who wish to develop their abilities.

FINDING: Teacher Certification requirements at elementary and secondary levels for personnel working within school situations has made it difficult, if not impossible, to make effective use of professionals in the arts in education of the gifted in the arts within the educational system.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Policies should be established in conjunction with the arts education associations and institutions involved in designing and developing certification requirements or procedures which would make more effective use of professionals in the arts and gifted and talented programs.

The arts in America and in education are in an incredible period of growth and retrenchment. Failure in one area matched by success in another; obstinateness and dogmatism balanced against high hopes and aspirations; innovation measured against long standing beliefs; new ideas, or new forms of old ideas, striving to be infused into traditional concepts of what is basic to education and what is not. Ironically, all this perplexity and doubt, certitude and incertitude, all these emotions, beliefs, and convictions are seeking to achieve a common goal--the creation of an educational system which will make a life that enriches society as well as the individual.

The present dichotomy of the arts in education movement expressed itself in many ways at the conference. Concert pianist, Lorin Hollander, spoke of "the fact that we have to beg for the funds for art education of the next generation indicates a lack of understanding of history and the human experience." Arts Endowment Special Assistant, Joe Prince, mentioned, "but as plagued as the arts are financially, they still have never flourished as greatly in the country as they do today." Harold Taylor commented that "realistically, in the last five years some extraordinary things have happened--theatre companies playing in high schools, first rate plays performed by good actors and good writers with a fine company. We didn't have that five years ago...On the pessimistic side, New York City has no teachers for music and art, they've all been dismissed. And all around the country the first thing to go in the programs in curricula are the arts."

James Smith, Board of Directors, Aspen Institute for Human Studies, spoke of "the shocking and continuing waste of irreplaceable physical materials... and waste of our most precious resources, the intellectual potential and innate talent of our people." While Edwin Martin pointed out that "we have to stop sometimes and realize that we have so dramatically raised our expectations for our education system in the last twenty-five years that we really lose sight from time to time of how far we've come." And Ruth Mondschein, Director, Special Projects, Washington, D.C., asked, "how do we change the attitude of the public? How do we change the attitude of the community leaders, of the volunteers, to realize that the arts are not a proliferal or fruitcake kind of thing, but rather inherent in the bricks and mortar of a community like the schools and the church...and

once we understand together what the impact of the arts means to the community, what the economics of the arts means to the community, and how we're all in it together, I think there'll be a terrific attitudinal change."

There was no need for an attitudinal change at Aspen. For the participants, the arts are basic to education and to an understanding of humanity. They aid one society in comprehending and relating to another society, and a society relating to itself. The arts, indeed, are a vital and integral expression of human uniqueness, as important to the advancement of humanity as the splitting of the atom. For the spark of advancement begins with a curious mind, and curiosity and the innate thirst for discovery found within humanity are creative processes, requiring gifts and talents, talents which need to be nurtured and supported whether they be ultimately utilized in the pursuit of science, religion, business, the arts, or any other human endeavor. And by improving the opportunities for the gifted, we not only enrich their lives, but our own, for often they are the ones who show us new dimensions of human spirit and thought.

The Aspen conference afforded the participants the opportunity to examine old ideas, explore new ones, and exhange information and knowledge which, through the recommendations, will result in the develoment of new national and state policies on the arts and the gifted. As one participant said, "I have never been to a conference where I've heard as much good information presented to the participants and as much good information coming as a result of the conference; it has been a thoroughly magnificent experience."

Michael Newton, during a conference discussion on the state of the arts in America, closed his presentation with some extemporaneous thoughts about the arts in education which also eloquently summed up the community of though which flowed from the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted. He said in closing:

> "The ultimate beneficiaries of this discussion here should not be those people who attend the conference...they should rather be the boys and girls in our schools today and tomorrow, and they should include generations of young people yet unborn. And our work and our wish for them, is that they should find the schoolhouse a place where they may come face to face with that powerful contradiction of the arts, that the arts demand the most intense discipline, but it is a discipline that can ultimately liberate us, liberate our imagination, our understanding, and yes, our sense. And in this contradiction, surely lies our ultimate conference for the coming together of the arts and education, because ultimately our goals are in accord. We're both concerned with the development of citizens of a state where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are attainable. And sure we only live and are free, and experience that fuller happiness that goes beyond self-gratification, if we have explored the extraordinary range of our capabilities as human beings."

Music as a Statement of Human Conviction
by Murry Sidlin, Music Director and Conductor
New Haven Symphony Orchestra

There is a definable and dangerous trend in America today toward making arts, artists, and arts institutions responsible to the public taste; forcing artists, as it were, to run for political office, to compromise if they wish to be acceptable for funding, to tailor their plans to work towards suggested guidelines, "to listen more to the people," as Mr. Duffy of the National Endowment for the Humanities has said. After all, grants are issued by government agencies, and government agencies are accountable to congressional funding, and congressmen want to be re-elected; so why spend monies which their constituencies do not approve of, or cannot understand. All of this proves that Ibsen was right, I fear, when he observed that for every politician who crops up--another artist is ruined.

You see, by evaluating the validity of a planned work of art according to the number of people it will reach in order to satisfy accountability requirements which are geographical, racial, sexual, and social, the quality and uniqueness and excellence of arts, as Robert Brustein of Yale has said, "is less rewarded than its social utility." I wonder if Jesus could have gotten a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities when he began; for in those days he had but 12 disciples--not exactly overwhelmingly in demand by the general population of the Roman Empire. Or in ancient Athens would Socrates have been denied an NEH grant because the NEH felt that they were neglecting the philosophers of Sparta an equal amount of public funds. The fact that there were no philosophers in Sparta or that thinking of that war state was grossly inferior to the great center of philosophy in Athens would be, I fear, of little concern to NEH according to present criteria; which I said is concerned more with geographical, ethnic, sexual and social equalization in funding, more than with the excellence to which major humanistic and artistic forces, individual and organizational, should aspire. A well known conductor of a major American symphony orchestra said recently to me that he is becoming increasingly concerned that the future NEA grants to his orchestra will be contingent upon balancing his Jewish concert master with an Arab cellist. In the New York Times of May 28, 1978, in an article entitled, "Symphony Orchestras Turning to Pop Artists," one manager of a major western symphony shouts fanfares about his ability to increase his audiences so dramatically over the past six years by giving more and more pop concerts each season in order to "be more appealing to the givers of government grants and tax-base support money." There are many, many orchestras in America which have been forced to triple their number of pops concerts for the same reasons, while the number of their subscription concerts or high art concerts have stayed about the same.

As regards the issue of listening to the people, can you imagine Beethoven taking the people into account while composing? Can you imagine him filling out a grant application to the NEA? His description in the general projects synopsis would have probably read something like this: "I need the money to support me while I compose a symphony, a work which you and the rest of the world will not understand for quite a while; full of unpredictable and explosive uses of musical elements; a work greater than mankind presently deserves, but one which could endure the test of time and survive forever--as shall my genius." "Dear Mr. Beethoven," the rejection letter would have read, "we greatly appreciate your self-appraisal, but regret that you can't

be more specific about your project; nor it seems could you supply letters from any interested conductors or theater managers offering a first performance. In fact, your track record for worldly acceptance in today's musical society is rather dreadful, and frankly we were quite dismayed after the premiere of your second symphony to read that the critics likened your work to a snake writhing in agony, bleeding from the eyes, refusing to die. It's very hard for us to justify giving additional funds to a cantankerous, and dwarf-like social misfit, who is incessantly rude, crude, virtually deaf, and whose music just won't play in Peoria, or in general meet with any sort of common public fervor and/or favor. We recommend, however, that you write to the Office of Gifted and Talented, which by the way is administered under the program for the handicapped, and therein you might find a sympathetic ear--no pun or insult intended. Sincerely yours." Naturally, his followup letter is not readable on this stage.

My message, therefore, is one of great concern for the young unknown artists--that they should be allowed to lead and not follow. Chekhov said, "Bring the people up to Gogol and not Gogol down to the people." Now who are these people and how do we bring them up to Gogol? They are always the next generation, those who would profit from arts education programs in their schools, entitled to explore and discover what art means. But in the same way that we are placing infringments on the artists (how we select them for awards and what projects we will support based on criteria of public acceptance) we are denying to those people of that next generation those opportunities of enlightenment to explore and discover. And so it becomes a vicious circle, the less enlightened the audience--the more restriction on the artist, the more restriction on the artist--the less enlightened the audience. No matter what singular oasis you might cite, this is the current state. This is what we have allowed to happen, and this is how and why we are eliminating 3,000 music teaching positions from the public schools each year, even before Proposition 13 and Howard Jarvis, because music is just not part of that public demand in education. That same public demand that claims to be returning to basics, but without the basics of life--namely, music and the other arts. Even though in America today, and America is not only New York, the performing arts seem to be flourishing in great quantity, the major arts institutions are in extreme financial difficulty more than ever before because of rising costs of operation, causing curtailment of services to the community at large, causing the community to seek seed money for experimental projects to pick up that slack--some of which are excellent, but most of which are insultingly bad--and causing the young creator to become a political animal forced to comply to a public demand, public acceptance levels of public standards, instead of following his or her new outrageous and wonderfully twisted vision--that vision which has given us great art for centuries. Simultaneously in the public schools the arts are expendable in favor of something called "back to basics," which is a statement by adminstrators that, among other things, seems to say, "Ah! now here is something that I understand, now I shall make them into my own mediocre and unenlightened image."

Now today I am going to try and explain to you why I think this is all so very tragic. You know why you think this is tragic, but you don't know why I think this is tragic. I don't profess, unlike other people, to have anything new to say, except that I am going to try and convince you, to plead with you--whoever you are, whatever you do, whatever has brought you to Aspen--to make a commitment, to help apply the brakes to the shortsighted dangerous policies that permeate artistic America today, affecting and afflicting the artists, our standards for quality--all of which nurture

the terminal illnesses growing out of control in arts education. My young musician friends on the stage, who are from Boulder, Colorado, their teachers and I, have in mind to bring you in touch with what we can do and how we do it, in the hopes that you can visualize the impending absence and loss of it. Some of the greatest opportunities for enlightment about the human race are available through art and yet it all may soon be denied their younger brothers and sisters. I shall ask each of you--teacher, administrator, artist, unclassified human being among us--that you listen and try with me to adapt for yourself the meaning of what is essential, what is just, what is quality, and then set about to solve the problems. These problems exist now because we have always started with them and then formed our arts education policy from them. Accepting the fact that there will always be problems of various sorts on all levels, we can deal with them through commitment and determination. Don't you remember the story of the man who visited his Rabbi with his particular problem. The man said, "Rabbi I have a great problem. My son has just converted to Christianity." "Ha!" said the Rabbi, "you think you have a problem--my son just converted to Christianity. Now how can I be a spiritual leader to my congregation if I cannot be a spiritual leader to my son?" "Well," said the man,"Rabbi, what did you do?" "Well," the Rabbi said, "I went to my chief Rabbi to seek guidance." And the man said, "Rabbi, what did your chief Rabbi say?" "My chief said, 'Ha! you think you've got a problem--my son just converted to Christianity.'" "Rabbi what did your chief do?" The Rabbi said, "My chief went to the altar and spoke to God." "Yes, and what did God say?" "God said, 'Ha! You think you got a problem.'"

Well, putting problems aside for a while, I want to share with you my thoughts on art and music as the missing basis. About a year ago I was asked to serve on a committee to select earth sounds, including music, to be sent into the universe on Voyager, a space ship headed toward Jupiter to be shipped around that planet and hurled in to the mysterious infinite blackness which is dotted with floating solid gases of firey stars and planets. This space vehicle has the potential of traveling for over 300 million years, and if intercepted or happened upon by a life form, it is just possible that the message of who and what we are will be revealed, received and perceived through sound--sounds that comprise the environs of our planet, the natural sound of earth, sounds which we are able to provide through speech, diverse ways of saying hello and peace, and the sounds which we call music. Our committee, headed by astromer Carl Sagan, worked with immense concentration and devotion to our charge, because, we said, it was an exercise in faith. We had to presume that the recorder would make it to someplace and be activated and heard. On this premise we set about the task of contemplating how we wanted humans, our history, our sense of ourselves, interrelationships, our makeup, our--for want of any other term--souls, our inner beings to be perceived. For me the experience of delving into the definition of life through sound, and especially music, offered perrhaps one of the greatest revelations of my artistic life to date--the manifestation of many years of thought. You see, over a long period of time, from childhood through to the end of my conservatory years, I had been dealing with the how and the what of music--harmony, counterpoint, analysis and form, orchestration, instrumental techniques, solfeggio, conducting techniques, composition in whole or part, serialization, intonation, making a 17th and 18th century score applicable to and playable by a 20th century orchestra, phrasing, shading, stylizing, and over and over again the basics--always returning to the basics of how it is to be done with excellence. But having lived with musical beauty all my life, and having accepted it without question, only in the past eight years had I really

begun to ask why. Why does music exist, and what is the need that makes people create it? What is the common bond of the human race that demands us to make music for joy, for sorrow, for special celebration, for no celebration, for tragedy, for contemplation, for worship, to fill a moment, to create a moment? Why is the 4th of July non-existent without "Stars and Stripes Forever," why does Christmas demand of us "Handel's Messiah" and John Kennedy's death the funeral march of Beethoven's "Eroica"--why, not how, any longer, but why?

It was also about eight years ago that I began to think in more substantial terms about the needs of my audiences and how I should serve them better. Was there more meaning for me to their attending my concerts beyond providing the pleasure of sounds in the finest way possible? At that time I developed a way of thinking about audiences, which was to become an acknowledgement of the why of music--why music exists--which still guides me today, that in every audience, for which I perform, there are very likely three types of people. Someone is hearing me at great personal sacrifice, for whatever motivated that person to attend; someone is hearing a concert for the first time and demands our very best for that first impression; and the most sobering of all to realize is that someone may be hearing a concert possibly for the last time and demands for the final impression every ounce of beauty and meaning to which we as performers can aspire. And so this committee was now asking that we take all the questions of why most seriously, not for ourselves any longer, but for the probable beings of another part of the universe.

Where does one begin, or more importantly, how do ten people begin? Well it began appropriately enough at a very good Italian restaurant in Washington, D.C., and the bread and wine of our conversation went immediately to earth sounds. After agreeing on the usual and predictable--waterfall, baby crying, wind, fire, etc.--we were locked into a discussion of whether the sounds of war and violence were to be included. In other words, was violence a natural part or an exception to the human condition? Were we being cosmetic to ourselves by deleting violence; ashamed of ourselves by including it; or were we being truer to ourselves by omitting it; or truer to the picture of ourselves, as unfortunate as it may seem, by keeping it in? The answer tentatively was decided by Chariman Sagan to delete violence. But what is fascinating is that the answer soon became clearer to all of us as we worked on the actual selection of the musical examples the music was teaching us and finally affirmed to all of us that violence was, in fact, the exception to the human condition. But it was not fair of us to begin to educate our extraterrestrial counterparts to our exception without first introducing them to the rule of who we were, who we are, what we are, what we feel and know, and what we want to become. All of this we discovered was accessible through the wonder and mystery of music. We were, by extracting two hours of representative and collective sounds from life, able to reaffirm on tape a strong belief in ourselves--expressions of human conviction. The selection process itself was most demanding. We listened to amazing quantities of musical expression. I, of course, was quite insistent that we send adequate representation of western art music to space. I saw nothing wrong in a little boasting that we have Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Stravinsky, Debussy, Berlioz, Haydn, and Shoenberg. Now did you really understand what I just said? I said that we on earth have had Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Stravinsky, and others; that the human race produced these giants of art and that we were sending their sounds, their statements from earth, to represent all that has happened here as some of the best that we have produced. We were embarking on an

attempt to summarize the entire human experience through music. We selected music of the whole world representing diverse musical languages in the same way delegates of the United Nations all said hello in peace in the opening of the recording in their respective tongues. We selected a Gamelan orchestra of Bali, chants from African life, chants of Turkish life, Blind Willy Johnson moaning through his own guitar strings about the pain down deep; and all of this is perceptable without a lyric. We hear it and we feel it, and we know and identify with it because we have experienced it. The Bulgarian wedding song has a joyous sound; while the Indonesian lullaby is a comforting one. We can listen to the entire recording, not understand one word from those songs or even know explicitly the motivation behind this specific compostion, and yet it is all perceivable by its character of sound as to what was intended by composers and performers. More than the cliche implies when we say music is the international language--music is the universal extension of our ability to communicate. We seek sounds which go beyond the normal sounds that we make, the normal everyday means of expression. When words are no longer enough, people turn to music. Some go to the canvas and paint, others stand up to dance. But we all go beyond our normal means of communicating and this is the common human experience for all peoples on this planet. Based on cultural regionalizing the tones, the instruments, the approaches to sound will of course vary, but the needs, the motivation and meaning will not. Music then becomes to all of us the affirmation of existence, the sound of our inner-beings, the crying forth of our feelings, and the state of what we believe, and that music is timeless as well. We learn that a two-thousand year old Japanese flute traditional melody seems as young and as fresh as the two-hundred year old Back "Brandenburgs," or Stravinsky's last work, or last night's Jazz; only on earth does time seem to matter; but that the recipients of our gift of earth's sounds would not evaluate the human history and message within any time frame at all. Unlike the rampant misconception of our day, great timeless art is not responsible to any concept of relevancy though it may be born of specific time, place and purpose. Bach's great works were, in fact, commissioned for religious services but not confined to a public taste. The result was some of the greatest and most innovative music of all time. Yehudi Menuhin once said that to play great music you must keep your eyes on a distant star. I learned through all of this that to fully understand great music, all that it means and represents beyond the sounds themselves, one should serve on a committee to select music <u>to be sent</u> to a distant star.

But for those whom the art and its sound are unfortunately not enough, for whom the why of music is still a distant and cool idea of some limited interest--instead of an ovewhelming and passionate mystery--I would suggest that there is a great deal to be learned of a political and social nature through an examination of great works and their composers. Take for example Dmitri Shostakovich and his music and how much we can discover about Soviet attitudes and culture in the 20th century, as well as the whole matter of human rights, supression of creating and thought! Shostakovich began composing seriously as a young student and his music was revered both for its promise and immediate substance. In the Soviet Union, where he was born and lived, a composer's future is determined by a board of review and everything to be performed publicly was thoroughly examined to see if it was worthy of mass attention and consumption. Shostakovich's early works were found to be very qualified and indeed he was becoming quite well known. However, in the late 1930's he composed an opera entitled "Lady Macbeth of Muszinsk"; a parody of life under the Czar with vivid depictions of murder, rape, incest, and all sorts of ghastly scenes of life--some were meant to be comical, others specifically tragic. The press loved it. The critics of music and

art raved of the greatness of this remarkable opera. But at a later performance, Premier Joseph Stalin attended and was horrified by what he saw and heard, and denounced the opera as a degenerate work unfit for the Soviet peoples. The critics and the press then reversed their initial declaration and printed instead what Stalin had said. Shostakovich then became persona non grata. His colleagues were afraid to be with him and to associate professionally with him. His music was not performed until several years later when he composed his "Fifth Symphony" and he presented it "as a Soviet artist's reply and apology to just criticism." This most famous work is quite serious, somber and dramatic in its initial statements, lyrical in reverie and painful--even screaming--with full forces of emotional strength at times, and ending with astounding majesty, victorious, positive, affirmative and optimistic musical evocations. Did he mean it all as an apology? And did he, in fact, temper his language to insure his recognition as a Soviet composer? Had he not formally apologized through his medium, would he have been able to live without composing; for his works probably would have never been played again. Well, this new composition gave him a new life and some of the fulfillment he sought; though it required of him, we think, great compromise of the most demanding and dangerous sort. The great Hungarian composer Bartok commented on this compromise in his concerto for orchestra where in the Fourth Movement he has the oboe laughing at Shostakovich for acquiescing to the Soviet demand to temper his use of musical language. (musical example). Then the laughter in retrospect becomes a more sardonic expression, for soon the true color of Bartok's message emerges as a sad and mournful quasi Russian tune, which might be translated to mean "why do you allow yourself to be controlled in your art, submitting to standards instead of setting them, being judged by those who cannot share your great vision--for the inner voices which you hear in your inner ear are unheard except in your own head. The invention of these sounds are your instincts; as instinctive to you as walking and sleeping and eating would be to anyone else." In this one tune does Bartok weep for unleashed art; the suppressed combinations of sound lying dormant in Shostakovich's brain, and the governmental act which kept them locked in. (musical example)

Throughout history there have been hundreds of vital expressions in music of human conviction. In Haydn's unique music, especially the "Mass in Time of War"; in Chopin; Benjamin Britten in the "War Requiem"; Penderecki in the "Dies Irae For the Victims of Auschwitz", and in Micahel Tippet's "Child of Our Time", composed while he was in prison during World War II for resisting the draft as a conscientious objector; and Debussy and his "Noel des Enfant qui n'ont Plusles Maisons"; Beethoven and his affirmation: the Mighthy Ninth Symphony, his declaration against injustice via the music to Egmont; the dedication of his Third Symphony to symbolize internationality of all people--a German composer giving forth a symphony dedicated to a French leader and affixing to it an Italian title; and when that leader indicated his imperial desires over his liberation intentions, Beethoven tears up his dedication and writes instead, "to the memory of a great man." Certainly these few examples should satisfy those for whom the music itself is not justification enough for universal attention.

In works which are non-programmatic in nature, there is an astounding amount of meaning in the relationship of the sounds themselves and why the tones were arranged in that special way. It is not necessary to listen, for example, to Mozart with visions of the glitter of the 18th century court or pastorial scenes--this was not the intention of the music. If these images strike you as you listen, there will be no citizen's arrest, but to

start with those visions, when they were not intended, is of no value, and, in fact, a deterrent to the artistic vision which was the communication of the sounds themselves. But why is the majority of Mozart's music of a certain character--constantly eliciting descriptive terms such as gaiety, charm, serenity, even ethereal in its beauty--when we know that he was a bitter, angry and sickly man who simply burnt out at the age of 36 (possibly from hypo-thyroid among other things); whose childhood was spent traveling, being exploited by his father for money, forced to show off his talent from the age of three upward, being nursed for scarlet fever in a coach enroute to his next performance, always away from his mother (and she dying while he was traveling)--all of this loneliness, suffering, unhappiness, and hardly a tinge of it evident in his music--how, why? Probably because it was his desire, conscious or subconscious, to express how he wanted to feel instead of how he really felt--that art, and especially music, can be used to pronounce, define, and unfold from within us the ideal and the desire for it; and such was the case of Mozart. No matter how long or short the composition, or in what medium it is performed--be it voice or string or wind instruments; a nose flute; a french horn; a two-string bamboo pole; or a five-string double base; a solo chant sung on a hill with a tear in the voice and wide vibrato; or a simple sustained quiet melody of a mother's lullaby; (love and comfort) in a tune; whether it's Nina Simone singing "Mississippi Goddamn"; or Louie playing "Kansas City Blues"; or hundreds of thousands joining hands with Martin Luther King to sing "We Shall Overcome"--the same inner-reflection, spirit, passion, and message, (the common human experience, as expressed by the order and relationship of pitch, rhythm and color of tone organized into completeness, into music) is possible. One need only listen through one's own senses to know what it all means, regardless of language or specific artistic or sociological intent. (Orchestra plays examples of Bach, Mahler, Haydn, Beethoven and Sibelius.)

With all this understanding and power (sensual and aesthetic and philosophical beauty and communication) at our fingertips, and for all of its meaning, there is not a national policy in the teaching of music or the arts and, therefore, we must recognize its impending doom in the public schools. Not only is there no national policy, but no related national curriculum. If a child changes schools from Oregon to Connecticut, for example, there will be some relationship between what the child will have experienced in that grade in most of the "major" learning disciplines. This is not true of music where the ad hoc, ad libitum approach add up to a further reflection of its national unimportance. Certainly school systems would never consider major cutbacks in programs of reading, mathematics, science, history, and others of the so-called "major subject" areas of education, because there is, in fact, a national advocacy policy and a national acceptance of the academics as essentials. But in music and other arts there is a constant subjection to the whim of whoever is the superintendent at the moment and usual acquiescence to him or her by boards of education. In school systems across America every spring the arts sit in death row waiting for some governor, hopefully, to commute the sentence. At this brilliant juncture in our history, at this awakening moment of human cognizance, at this time of our greatest peace potential, we virtually mock the message of past centuries and of our present earthly brothers and sisters, and characterize the products of their unique musical expressions, the components of those products, and the huge works of uncanny magnitudes of thought and reflected beauty, by calling it all non-essential to education, not worthy of our financing, frivolous, fluff, frosting to education and learning, and therefore to life!! How tragic!! Why do we insist on perpetuating

our own mediocrity instead of finally implementing what we said we are going to do--to develop the entire child fully--which means the aesthetic sense as well as the intellectual capacity. Full potential is being denied full blossoming as long as our children are deprived of the exposure to meaningful music, which includes the understanding and the concepts that I have been speaking about today.

What can we recommend? I advocate for grades K-12 a program of music literacy, the reading and understanding of the art and its elements required for everyone and given equal emphasis to anything else which is considered basic in education in the curriculum--no compromise!

Secondly: at present our young people are directed through valuable, enlightening, inspiring, and provocative programs in English literature to come in contact with works such as Julius Caesar, Tale of Two Cities, Silas Marner, Ulysses and the works of Wadsworth, Longfellow, Tennyson, to name but a few. Therefore, they are entitled to learn the equally greats works of Bach, Beethoven, Stravinsky, Mozart, Schoenberg, Ravel, Haydn, Sibelius, Mahler, Gershwin, Berlioz, Louie Armstrong, Billie Holiday, Chin, Georgian Counterpoint, the Gamelan Mariachi, and the full internal and universal meaning of it all; equally enlightening, equally inspiring, equally provocative and profoundly important in the pursuit of the complete literacy and aesthetic development of the child--no compromise.

Thirdly, in addition to the study of great works of music and the establishment of a standard of, and program in, music literacy for everyone, I want to propose a more thorough, massive and firmly established non-potpourri approach to artists in the schools for every school system in America. At present there are pockets of projects by affiliate artists of New York, Young Audiences, and many local projects which fulfill a need for the moment and are often effective in presentation, depending of course on the ability of the performers to communicate, but most often these shows are really special events and not incorporated or integral to the school program as they should be. There are thousands of first-class young musicians graduating annually from the best American conservatories--which are the best in the world as well--who are highly skilled, beautifully articulate and dynamic, who love young people, and who love making music and could serve these needs perfectly. Very often these musicians form themselves naturally into chamber music ensembles, string quartets, trios, brass ensembles, woodwind quintets, percussion ensembles, piano trios, madrigal groups, chamber chorus, and the seeemingly infinite number of diverse ensembles for which there are tons of high quality music literature available, and even more in the minds of the equally available talented young composers. These people must be harnessed as community resource people and paid to enlighten and perform, to rehearse, invent, stimulate, excite our young people about music, music making, composing, and all that is contained therein. This could become an artistic equivalent of the Civilian Conservation Corps; though this is not considered a training ground for beginners, amateurs, or even added employment for the pop musician. (Young people do not need additional pop experience as a part of their enlightenment, for they have easy access to a great deal of it, and it is quite common to their immediate environment.) This is a chance for quality to serve, and quality to be heard. This is a chance for the professional artist to join hands with the devoted and professional art educator to serve the student who is commited to music, the student who is new to music, and the general community in which both students reside. These young chamber musicians who would live in the community could also form

the nucleus of the community orchestra--upgrading their level--and assist in coaching of outstanding music students, and generally be available to administer musical needs as they might be invented. The potential is limitless. The young talented music graduate who does not want to consider alternatives to his or her ideal of playing chamber music and performing for a living would have an opportunity to begin a career in a similar way to those who practice medicine or law--the chance to work and be paid for what you love most and do best.

Too often today the young musicians simply cannot find employment in the early years equal to the residency of the physician or the beginning position in a law firm available to young lawyers. There are only 38 orchestras in America today which pay the musician anything near a fulltime living wage and only about 15 of those 38 offer salaries of real significance. There are even fewer than 38 fulltime chamber ensembles, and if each orchestra is comprised of an average of 95 musicians, and each ensemble averages four people, one can see how few musicians in America are actually stable in their careers. In the May 1978 International Musician, the trade organ of the American Federation of Musicians, only 28 openings existed in all of the major 38 orchestras for the entire country for next season. Therefore, there is a great deal of talent at our disposal to work as artists in schools through out the country. In addition to the thousands of excellent young musicians who could be engaged on a fulltime basis, we could entice the visiting talent--those who come to a community to perform recitals or play with orchestras-- to make their contributions as well. How I hate to sit in my hotel room when I guest conduct, and yet I spend a good deal of time doing just that. When I appear in a city as a guest conductor I am usually on location for about five days or more. Rehearsals occupy only about two or three hours a day, prior to the performances, and in many cities rehearsals are held in the evenings. I could be giving clinics by rehearsing bands, orchestras, coaching ensembles, working with choruses--and would love to be asked. Many of my colleagues would love to be assisting and contributing in some way, lending support to the local music education program as well, and if called upon would, whenever possible, accept with alacrity the invitation to meet with young musicians of any grade level, or meet with non-music students to aid in introducing them to music. Why isn't some school system brave enough to attempt to design a string seminar with Pinchos Zuckerman, a voice class with Maureen Forrester, a piano class with Lorin Hollander, and a band or orchestra session under the guest direction of any number of talented concerned conductors throughout America? And is it so far from this narrow window of opportunity to the great fields outdoors which could include dance classes with Villela, and other artists contributing as guests to seminars on poetry, painting, film, theater, and other various and obvious sub-divisions? Do not physicians and dentists contribute to medical clinics? Why not build something of great and longlasting substance into the curriculum? Resident performers, visiting performers, and resident teachers could all devise a related program from literacy to great works to the involvement in performance with attention to growth and development achieved gradually within the various experiences as it is in all areas of learning. When we study languages, each new chapter or unit introduces specific concepts to add on to the foundation in a step-by-step approach, and then we use those new concepts of grammar and additional vocabulary in a story which is designed to re-enforce and allow us to experience what has just been learned! The next chapter then builds on those concepts, and so it goes. Now with composers who might respond to specific educational needs working with teachers this common proven and constructive approach might be tried in a

program of music literacy. Simultaneously, much as in language study, great works should be introduced, its insights shared, philosophy explored, sounds enjoyed, though it may be somewhat advanced from the basics of the literacy program. Eventually we would love our students of language to be able to go to a foreign film without subtitles and foreign countries without dictionaries. And so we want children to listen to music comfortably, to understand and to respond and be sensitized to enlightenment.

Now at this point, someone always throws in the either/or argument--music or drivers-ed, art or typing, arts education or sciences. And even here in Colorado, at a dinner party not too many evenings ago, someone implied-arts education or the lovely parks of Denver--you can't have both. Yet no one ever says CIA or Pentagon, Army or Navy, NASA or NIH, Yankees or Mets, Baretta or Kojack. Is the real question one of finances? If this were a program of math or science in 1956 under Eisenhower, would anyone ask that question--wouldn't the funding somehow turn up as it did? If this were a program of reading, wouldn't the funding sources be there? Well this is a program of life, of art, of beauty, of aesthetics, of feeling, thinking, knowing, understanding, wishing, wondering, fantasizing, doing, and, by the way, reading of symbols into sounds, translating equations of vibration into pitch and concepts of math into duration. It is a program of cultures, and governments and philosophy; that's what music is. The question is not one of funding but one of priorities. What do we consider important enough for our dedication, our commitment, and only then the implementation which includes funding and budgets! I'm so frightened when I read about the defense budget more, and more. It's beginning to look to me as though the entire budget of the NEA and NEH would run the Pentagon and CIA for about eight hours--and that must be someone's priority.

Now, I would like to add a further word of dismay directed to some who claim to serve the causes of which I speak, who instead contribute to the problems by indicating our single house is in disorder by abusing their opportunities to contribute. I deplore the arrogance of one who claims to have "come to his senses," for standing before 6,000 music educators in Chicago this past April; all of whom were looking for direction and leadership, a message of how to contend with and fight against the current state, from a person who understands the political framework and aspires to authority recognition within it. He offered no prepared text, no hope, no message, no understanding of the immediate urgency of their plight; simply another "let's pull together" cheer--more creeping about at a petty pace, signifying nothing.

And I deplore the actions of yet another who stood before a statewide arts symposium in Connecticut a few weeks ago and said as a member of the staff of the NEA that he felt the most recent solos of John Coltrane, "were more imaginative and exciting than the most recent interpretation of the 'Ninth.'" Assuming he meant Beethoven's "Ninth," how dare a member of our government's art agency insult the genius of both Beethoven and Coltrane by locking them into competition; an artistic wrestling match--Bethoven versus Coltrane--interpretive versus creative--jazz versus symphonic music. And how dare he cry "racism" when someone merely questions his concept of the so-called "community art." Many of us who are artists simply cannot tolerate Mr. Rockefeller's indifference, or Mr. Spellman's public provocation; and the current state should not be burdened with a further divided or further weakened house. There is only the art, the people who serve it, and the people who hear, see and feel it. I have a great deal of

difficulty determining for sure under which category, if any, so many of our proponents and self-proclaimed servants come.

Look, what is a man or woman if not a creature of expression, a beautiful and independent force of nature, a reflection of all he or she has seen, heard, felt and thought, unique in how it has been assembled and even more unique in how it will all be expressed. If we are to live and love with each other we must respect and acknowledge our own beauty and uniqueness--for only then shall we respect it in others. Our young must study the uniqueness of others to discover it within themselves. In the order of the universe and in all of us there is music. In the wind and sea there is music, in our souls there is music bursting to be born. One must listen to it and bring it forth and share it with our partners on earth. "Servant and master and I," said the anonymous poet. "Servant of those dead and master of those living. Through my spirit immortals speak the message that makes the world weep and laugh and wonder and worship, for I am the instrument of God--I am music." Oscar Wilde recognized that in music one can live an extention of his or her own life. And he said in the Critic, "As an artist, after playing Chopin, I feel as if I have been weeping over sins that I have never committed, mourning over tragedies that were not my own. Music always seems to produce that effect. It creates for one a past of which one has been ignorant and fills one with a sense of sorrows that have been hidden from one's tears."

And now may I ask you to let the music speak TO YOU!!!! Let us conclude with the brief but brilliant evocation of a man's love of home, his people, and their history, not a statement of extreme nationalism, but a painting in sound in which he shares his life; not an attempt to convince others by force of sound, or an effort at conversion to a new religion, or declaration of superiority, or aplogoy for inferiority, or a question of integrity; just Sibelius and his "Finlandia" allowing our young musicians to learn that the meaning of the music is in the music itself! (Orchestra play "Finlandia" by Sibelius.)

Exemplifying the content of this text, Murry Sidlin was the guest conductor at a concert given by the Fairview High school Orchestra and Chorus of Boulder, Colorado at the Forum on the Arts and Gifted held in Aspen, Colorado in June of 1978. The orchestra conductor is Andrea Meyers and the choral director is Ron Revere. Selections inlcuded: Bach's Contata #50; Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, last movement; Mahler's Adagietto from the Fifth Symphony; Haydn's Piano Concerto in D Major, first movement (Charles Shadle, pianist); and Sibelius' Finlandia.

Extemporaneous Speech
given by
Lorin Hollander
at the National Forum on the Arts and the Gifted
Aspen, Colorado, June 1978

I was a child prodigy. When I was three, my father, who is a very great violinist and a good Dad gave me a violin, which I refused to hold in my left hand, and attempted to play backwards. After two weeks I smashed it very coldly and empirically against the fireplace. In our living room was a piano, which was my toy, but I would only use the notes from the middle G downward, which were the notes that my father could not reach on his violin. And I began what I now look at as composing and was already involved in dealing with emotions in my compositions. When I entered kindergarten, I gave my first concert, which was actually in the kindergarten class, and the whole day seems now rather - rather - metaphoric. It was called "Circus" and the other members of the community pretended to walk tightropes, pretended to train animals, or were clowns and I played the two-part inventions of Bach. After the concert I had my first confrontation with the attitude of Arts & Lectures committees to all Bach performances: I was beat up in the schoolyard, by my audience, which was also my first run-in with musical criticism although slightly less abstract than one normally finds it.

When I was eleven I played in Carnegie Hall and have been performing since. Following Ericson's nicely laid out cycles, while continuing to perform I have three or four times undergone profound changes in my personality and, I believe, in the actual dynamics of my nervous system.

Where does one begin to examine the personality of the creative human being? How deeply does one go? Well I believe very deeply. One eventually has to examine on a quantum level the actual energy of which we are made. And how far back does one go? I believe very far back. As a matter of fact, I'm going to ask you to follow me for a moment. I want to begin approximately sixteen billion years ago, with the Big Bang. This is, again the most viable theory. (Fred Hoyle withdrew his steady state theory which was a very beautiful move in itself). The theory is probably very close to the actual picture of the formation, in this cycle, of the universe. What happened before the Big Bang we don't know.

Everything that is, the quasars, the nebula, the galaxies, the black holes, the billions upon billions upon billions of stars in each of the billions upon billions of countless billions of galaxies, in this incredibly complex, beautifully poetic dance of energy we call the universe, (Our concepts conscious of time, and speed and distance, of course, are very complex.), all of this, including "that of which we are made," the littlest pieces of which we are made, were compacted into a giant egg. And this egg exploded, spitting out the particles which make up our universe. And in exploding it expanded. It is still expanding. And it started to swirl, violent, coagulative forces, pulling together masses of this material, heating it to unimaginable temperatures, and having these newborn suns explode, spitting out ever more complex elements. These elements are involved in further coagulative energy forces, more stars, more time. (To grasp, simply, the distances involved requires a release of our ego-held solidity of earth, I believe,) and somehow these elements

again coagulated, in a very complex way, into systems--planetary systems.

Here we are, next to a very unexceptional star, our sun, with just the right distance, correct amount of heat. Somehow, for some reason, this drive for greater complexity brought about, probably before the planet actually solidified, a chain of energy, which the more we understand, the more we realize how difficult it is, to indicate what is animate, what is inanimate; somewhere in there it is handy to call this "life." First in the acid chains, the acids, then to the cellular level, then we switch paradigms to that of the evolutionist, where we follow a flowing ooze of life from the seas, these warm, dark, salty places, ever more complex, onto the multicellular level, the plants, the hydras, ever more complex, onto the land, the plants, more complex, more complex animals, the living and the dying, birth, coagulation, complexity, death, entropy but continuation, the same particles being used, animals evolving, millions of mutations, some unnoticed, some happening to catch on, being pushed from within, by genetics, pulled from without by environment; the dinosaurs, the trees, the primates, this coursing, flowing ooze of life, until suddenly this planet brought forth man's brain and what we call consciousness; if there is a reason, for some reason, possibly this substance needed information on itself; possibly the genes really are in control; but suddenly this ooze developed eyes, and it began to vibrate, to dance, to sing, to show colors; man's brain.

Lewis Thomas, in Lives of the Cell, draws a very interesting picture. He tells us we must now look at an anthill in a different way. We can no longer see it as a community of thirty thousand to a hundred thousand ants, separate, in the community. We must now see that anthill as the animal. The anthill is the organism, made up of thirty thousand to a hundred thousand little parts, which having had many millions of years more of evolutionary time, are mobile, they can separate further than the parts in our own organism. If the anthill senses food, a quarter of a mile away, it sends out a quarter-of-a-mile-long tentacle, (which seems to us to be many thousands of separate ants) leaving, pulling, and carrying the food back on the tentacle to the body. The queen ant inside is a huge, pulpus, indulating, cream, spewing out cells; it lives many years; the other cells are maleable. We look at the anthill sending out army ants onto the surface of the hill, to repair, and they're left to die, and we think "how cruel." except it's metaphorically like our skin cells. But, it is the relationship between the individual ants in the anthill, the myriad complex exchanges of information that I would like to focus on: the way they touch, send out smells, make sounds and otherwise inter-connect in a complex system that is somehow reminiscent of the neural synapse. There is an elaborate web of connective tissue that binds the members of the hill together.

I think it is jejune to see a society of men or a family of men as one larger animal; it doesn't really help us to see it that way. But something very complex is happening here. Our bodies are made up of 55% alien little other organisms known as the mitochondria. They got involved in the cells, while the earth was forming, and did so very happily. They are identical to the little creatures in the lichens and the sea-cucumbers and the plants, and the fish and other animals. As we walk around, feeding our faces with food, breathing the air, talking to each other, trying to make it and be hip, are they running the show? Are we feeding them? When we die and go into the earth and or energy breaks up they continue, find someplace else to live, and continue. As Lewis Thomas says, if he understood the relationship between those mitochondria and what we call our beings, he would have a new way of explaining music to himself.

We have to switch paradigms again. The arts, to me, are the emotions. In the approximately thousands of societies that anthropologists and historians have studied, virtually all of them put a central focus on the arts, and more important, on the socialization of their young in the arts. For whatever reason, the human being is born with his body and his mind still part of the evolutionary chain. He is an animal. These forces, which we call the emotions, can be recognized in other animals in various ways. In man, these emotions are the connective tissue we saw in the anthill. What are we supposed to do with these emotions? In a child, it's survival. An infant feels terror, longing, hunger, rage, and as the little person starts to grow, what is he supposed to do with these emotions? How is he supposed to deal with them? Well, of course he learns from his parents, he learns from his peer configurations, and he learns how to put up a front. He learns of the incessant games and rituals, the way in which people in a society interact. How does he deal with the rage, and terror, and longing, and the unspeakably subtle variations--and they are unspeakable, because there are no words for many of these feelings--at least not in our language. Where will he deal with these, if not in the arts? How will he learn to connect to other human beings in a healthy way, if not by singing, moving his body, using sounds, pictures, tastes, smells? This is the very connective tissue; it binds the human fabric together.

The central nervous sytem is complex. The brain is complex. With all that we've learned, the scientists who study nothing else, believe they are still at the beginning. As a musician, I'm involved in a very conscious experience of the left side and the right side of the body. I'm always dealing with and putting certain emotions and ideas through the left side: bass and tenor, certain feelings through the right side: soprano and alto, concepts of structure through the left, content through the right. When a few hundred years ago we set up the keyboard, why did we put bass here; why does the violinist hold the violin in the statistically weaker hand, doing very difficult things with the statistically weaker hand, in order to express, to sing, the soprano line through the right hand? Why does he view bass to treble left to right. The cellist also. Conversely why does the oboe player reverse the hands when he uses the lips? I've searched in vain through medieval manuscript illuminations for an instrument held in the opposite fashion. I found one, but there is a good chance that the plate was reversed, which didn't help us any. Why is the left "sinistre" and "gauche?" On the other hand we have "righteous," "rectify" and the right hand of God--why did they hang those left-handed kids out of the window in the Catholic Church? Ambi-dextrous means two right hands. Some suspicion--the lefthand side is the side of evil--there's some suspicion. There have been men and women who have been either synisthesiacs or mescaline freaks, who experience the mixing of the senses. Alexander Scriabin was one: when he heard sounds, he tasted something and smelled something, he saw lights, he felt things all over his body. Conversely when he smelled something he heard sounds and tasted. When he experienced feelings in his body he heard the sounds; in other words, he used his nervous sytem as a membrane, a common denominator to link, very specifically, colors, sounds, tastes, smells; he was busy working on a symphony for incense; trying to work out the breathing patterns of his audience, which of course when hearing one doesn't contend with. He spent weeks lying out in the moss, playing with the spiders and the ants, letting them climb all over him and eating raisins and just opening his body orifices and really tried to become a part of the flow and his symphony also called for incense, lozenges to be taken, lights to be shined

in the face, with all sorts of cues to the types off hues, the magentas and the greens and the purples, and then he died from a boil on the lip, possibly caught when he was lying out in the moss.

The point is we're dealing with something very, very complex. I tend to feel that what the educational system does with our children is put them in a straight jacket. I think they are doing to our children what the nutritionalists told us we were doing with apples, and cucumbers, and rice: taking off the important stuff, throwing it away and eating the pulp.

A back-to-basics mentality in the school, if it weren't so tragic, would be ludicrous. But that's what they're doing. How dare they? How dare they trust whatever common denominator came up with this theory: that the arts and arts education are expendable to mankind; whoever came up with that theory? When funds are low, one takes it away only from the arts? It seems to me, if your funds are low: you take some away from the sports, some away from the arts, some away from the languages, some away from--no, they take it away only from the arts. This is criminal. It is not intelligent. I believe that if arts education is not handled with creativity and care and brilliance in the public schools, then we are asking for severe mental disturbance in our communities. How will people touch, spiritually embrace? We are equipping kids with words and numbers, and strong legs and arms, and then they confront each other, spout at each other, have no sense of the humanity in each other, like two points of triangles, with their feelings behind them, never learning how to use them, and these feelings are then turned inward, and we have to turn to Mr. Freud to find out what happens. Neurosis, irrational emotions, people who lock their parents up in old age homes, who relate to their spouses as parents, experience love as oppression, yell at their kids. Pretty much the picture of what this community, the United States, suffers from. Well, we have to sound a warning. And it has to be a warning, as Mr. Nixon said, with teeth. When the A.M.A. comes and says "Don't eat butter because it leaves little things in your heart", they listen! They may still eat butter, but they know. When the A.M.A. says "Don't smoke, because you'll grow lumps," people still smoke but they know what is going on. We have to warn "If you remove arts education from the schools, this is asking for mental disturbance."

And I'll tell you some things that are quite personal. When I was a child, eighteen, nineteen months, I lived in a world of colors and sounds and feelings; I felt swayed between forces. I didn't use language until I was almost five. I knew what was going on. I was very much in a state of terror; I was frightened of people and the feelings they aroused in me. And then I found the keyboard. And I found the twelve tones; and within moments I knew the names of those notes, I understood what they looked like on the keyboard, and I had, I think, already a feeling for structure and tonal cohesion. My practice time was spent briefly dealing with the stuff my teachers gave to me, then, the rest, improvising; sitting at the piano and playing; from my own head. My parents were very helpful; my experience was that they wanted me to practice; I don't remember whether I went to the piano totally on my own; I always know that they expected it. But I went, and often spent from eight to fourteen to sixteen hours a day at the keyboard. I also went to public school. On those days obviously there was less practice but there were still six to seven hours a day. School was easy, mathematics I understood, spelling I understood, language I understood. Somewhere along the line I learned that my improvisations, my compositions, were not what parents and teachers expected--aroused

their anger and caused me shame. By the time I was seven I would only compose when I was alone. A child musician is an important phenomenon to study. He is different than the chess-player, or the mathematician, or the poet, or the painter, because the child musician is audible. The Freudian psychological dynamics are so in the open. He is audible in the household. Mommy and Daddy are always involved in his practice, so are the siblings, and the animals. Not only do parents know when he works, if they are musically knowledgeable, the child experiences that they are experiencing the content of his work. At first this is good, the child plays of course for them. Who else? And a type of musical image forms where he plays differently for the sister, the brother, for the parents, specifically for the grandma. And then we find this interesting triumvirate, with Mrs. Schekelmyer down the street who teaches the piano. Where if Johnny plays well at the lesson, Mrs. Schekelmeyer calls Johnny's mom and says "great lesson" and Johnny is showered with love. If however, Johnny did not play octaves, a la Horowitz, a call goes through and suddenly the house is filled with "Johnny must practice more," or do his lessons. Mama and Daddy put in their two cents. Practice time is monitored. Often parents come to me,and tell me "Oh, Johnny spends a lot of time at the keyboard, but all he does is play what he wants." Or, "he'll take his Beethoven and he'll change it--what should I do?" I tell the parents to lock him up! Hit him!

What is interesting is that about time of puberty, maybe a little earlier, the child musician begins to resent being heard. The emotions which he starts to put into the music become very complex, very sexual, very sensual, very intimate, as his little mind starts to grasp something of what the art is all about, although not yet anything of serious import. The early first years are busily spent putting together the most complex muscular, neural-coordinative, function that the human being is capable of manipulating a keyboard or another instrument with the digits, often separating the body into four lines, five lines, six lines. It is a fabulously complex, interesting, abstract and muscular discipline. It has profound effects on the way a musician thinks.

Then Johnny comes into the conservatory, and what do we find? He sits in the practice room, and instead of listening to his own work he's worrying about who's listening from the next practice room. Or maybe the teacher's walking out in the hallway, so he plays out for the teacher. Or conversely, possibly he feels safe in the practice room when there's a lot of noise in the hallway, but when there's no noise then suddenly he's exposed. Exposed! Or as he goes on the stage, with the type of nerves that should be reserved for the gas chamber, and with the type of thoughts while he's playing, "Oh God, here comes that run", and, "what if I was to miss that run--the teachers will know." He has brought his ghosts of Mommy and Daddy and siblings to the rest of his life, and often he never figures this out. Or he may figure it out and it doesn't help. Interestingly enough the feelings underneath these thoughts are what the musician has to work with. And if he is interested in growing as a human being, and maturing, and finally helping others, then he has to understand these things. Why the musician is important is because the process that the musician goes through in the studio in understanding the early psychology is a metaphor for the way all sensitive human beings go about understanding their natures, understanding their past, understanding their place in their personalities of those early figures. Why is it that the very feelings with which we create are so closely associated with guilt and shame and terror? Was it always so? Did Nietchze feel these things? Did Mozart feel these things? Did Jesus feel these things? Kazinsakis thought Jesus felt these things; his

descripiton of the early Jesus was of a very severe neurotic. Nietchze certainly, with his body twitches and strange way of mannerisms as a child; if he acted that way today he'd be in the Mayo clinic at the age of six.

What is this creative spark? What does it mean? Does everyone have it to a degree? What does it mean to be "gifted"; what is the prodigy?

When I was eleven I began to perform professionally, giving concerts, but I kept on with school. Often I'd have to turn in a paper late; my excuse would read "Please excuse Lorin from school; he was playing with the New York Philharmonic." My teachers didn't seem to care. "Sorry, Mrs. Hollander, that is no excuse, there was a paper due on so-and-so." But I had Mozart, and Bach, to show me the real path.

At seventeen I began to lose control of my right arm. It scared me, but also fascinated and amused me. I'd begun to read Freud. I'd developed an interest for religion and philosophy. I saw what was going to happen; I knew the histories of other prodigies. And so already early, by 19, I started looking at my nervous system as a laboratory and as a teacher. I'll tell you that from the age of 19-31, my nervous system underwent a profound change.

The musician is audible. He never has the feeling of being alone with his creativity. I saw immediately that was the crux of the problem with my hand. I wanted to be alone to make music. I already had two toally different personalities: one when I travelled and was alone to work, and one in my concept of home, with its warm, human aspects as well as its oppressive aspects. I carried my early childhood with me. At 22 and 23, I had all but lost control of my right side, although I continued playing, rewriting, rearranging, rethinking. But by that time I had an intellectual understanding of what was happening, and I began to listen. How interesting it is that many musicians when they practice do not listen. It is as if a painter was painting his canvas without looking. I started to listen and I noticed that I was hearing for the first time areas in the low range, tenor and bass. I began to recognize the two total personalities having to do with me, and I allowed my nervous system to teach me. I learned that there are moments when I am in the left side of the body, in other words the right side of the brain is active. I hear through the left ear; I concentrate through the left eye. I am aware of the shape of the music. If I tried to work on the areas which are not dealing with what my body is thirsting to work on, there is a sense of frustration, there is a sense of anger. So I've learned to trust my body in creativity; it knows what it needs.

In my middle twenties, I'd already regained much of the control, understood what was happening, and started to create with my music. I would take the notes of Mozart, make them mine, and then sing them in new and unique ways. I began to glimpse what structure was all about, and my growth as an artist began, then. The nervous system, being made out of--made up of the energy of the universe, mirrors a profound and crystalline structure. How we symbolize from our environment as young human beings nobody fully knows. But we take those symbols, and we begin to structure them. That's what art is about, content and structure; substance and shape.

What do we do with the children? When I hear those who form the policy on education speak (and I understand the difficulties), I wonder how often they think of the people whom they are educating as little live children. We have this pearl-colored little jewel, and it's up to us to tell it

things, to show it things. For me, I still feel like a child. I realize that many people still feel like children. I realize that the sense of being grown-up is a myth. It's a myth, because we expect to feel some day like grown-ups look to us when we are small, when their heads are like this, and their arms are like this, and the hairs on their bodies are like packthreads, and their voices boom, and we think one day we're going to feel like that. Well, that's--we search for God, and create father figures, the big joke is that we all feel pretty much the way we did. But somehow we don't talk about it. And it's up to us as grown children to experience all the rest of us also as more or less grown children. Whenever I see a group like this I try to distill it to a nine-year-old birthday party. I know you. But now we have these little ones, the children. What do we tell them? What do we show them? The vibrations are hitting its eyes, and its ears, and its nose and its tongue, its toes, its little things; --what do you tell it? It sees the flower; when it experiences a flower its body vibrates, its face scrunches up with the sticky smell, its eyes get large; that experience, the overwhelming experience! Well part of the process is that he experiences the flower again and again, little by little he starts to recognize the outline of the flower in his mind, learns the word flower, deals with the image of flower, and starts to change the impact of feelings into words, and starts to turn off the impact of the color and smell to where he can deal with it. It's interesting that some grown-ups, when they say "disoriented", are talking about just re-admitting some of those earlier sensations.

A human being can't go through life in those early years experiencing all. But how much are we supposed to push down? I think one of the most interesting studies happened in Sweden a few years ago, where they took children and tape-recorded the sounds that they make in infancy. And it seems that the child uses virtually every sound known in any language sometime in his gurgling. Trying them all out. And in some fabulous way that a priori subliminal biological imperative which Noan Chomsky has been looking for, takes the sounds around him, and the ones that are meaningful to the parents, to the environment, he uses; the others he throws away. If he were fed two languages he would incorporate the two languages, throw the other sounds away. Nine languages, take the nine languages and throw the other sounds away. You see the importance of this. If he sees people around him dealing with colors and lights as sounds, if he could take those things in, if he hears the differentiated sound as a baby, if he sees differentiated color, if he hears sound shaped, if he sees color shaped, somehow it's going to be pulled in. We don't understand how these early years work--I think it is very close to the open instincts that we see in other animals. There's a biological predisposition, but it has to be filled in at certain traumatic moments with environmental stimulus. It's very complex; we don't fully understand it.

If a child musician does not have the genetics to be a musician, you can play music to him til he's blue in the face, and he's not going to be a musician. If he has a genetic propensity for this type of abstraction, and the sensitivity to sound, and he does not hear music in the early years, chances are, he won't be an important musician. In those early years, the child goes to school. We, as a community have chosen certain people to be the teachers and certain people to make the policy in what to teach these children, and we hand the children over to them. That's the way our society works. But, somehow, these people with whom we have entrusted our children have made a gruesome mistake. They have decided to take the arts out of the schools. With this they are taking away from our children the chance

for them to express emotion in a creative way and to work with the concepts of quality, elegance, beauty, passion and artistic structure. They are taking away from our children the opportunity for them to learn the complex control of their thought processes and the way to achieve self-discipline and the ability to structure time for their own personal fulfillment. They are taking humanity out of the schools.

Words can deal well with emotions. But the raw emotion of artistic exchange and expression is in another world. When I sat with the Rockefeller panel, we came out with the warning I described. But the panel focussed on all the arts, for all the people. The focus was on the general education of the young child. It could not consider at this time in an important way, the very gifted. It dealt with the handicapped, and the aged, because they also were neglected; but the gifted remain neglected.

When I was in sixth grade, and composing a symphony a week, and memorizing a fugue in an hour, I spent my time in class cleaning the blackboards and carrying messages for the teachers. To their credit they treated me as an adult, and we used to discuss all sorts of things, and some of them advised that I should leave the school; but my parents felt that peer relationship was important.

How do we recognize the gifted child? Who makes this decision? How should his education differ? What is the gifted child? What made a Bobby Fisher and a Mozart? The real genius, one can look at, in his lifetime, and see that--how prolific, how single-minded, the complete elegance of his work, the perfection; these are the leaders. Whether it is a Gotema or a Mozart, an Einstein or an Emerson, these are the leaders. And those unnamed people in so-called primitive societies, the witch-doctors, the rain-makers, they are the leaders.

Whether their nervous systems are different, I don't know; their eyes are different. It is interesting, in the psychiatric community, studies are being done with nitrous oxide, and other gasses, to slowly starve the brain of oxygen, in a carefully controlled way. Certain experiences are being related, of vibration, starting in the two sides of the spine, and going towards the middle slowly and the type of thoughts, perspectives, a physical experience of the way in which thoughts resonate from the nervous system. The different frequencies of feelings along the spine and the medulla; and the type of thoughts. I think the relationship between intelligence and gifts is close. It's difficult to think that Bach was not intelligent; it's difficult to think that Mozart was not intelligent. Whether the I.Q. test measures anything but the ability to pass the I.Q.--it measures something. Whether the W.A.I.S. test measures anything but an X factor--it measures something.

It is interesting that those who don't understand the arts, assert we needn't give the arts to children; they need, instead, to have discipline. Don't they realize that the arts demand the most profound discipline? Don't they realize that the only discipline worth having is self-discipline, and the ability to work for quality for oneself? And I also don't believe in rationalizations for the arts that state one will do better in math if one studies music, or one will do better in English if one studies painting. I question the goals in education. I understand that we have a generation that can't add the checkbook, and can't put together an English sentence, and they look back and they say "Ah, that was because of progressive education." Progressive education stands for too much attention to the arts,

and a loss of discipline and authority in the classsroom. Why don't they first replace the discipline and authority (and the place of the super-ego child in relation to the teacher), and try the experiment that way with classical scientific control?

To be able to order sounds, so that it gives a shape, a tonal picture of structure, of proportions, that takes discipline. Don't they realize--(I realize that "they" is amorphous usage, substitute for "they" whoever hold the responsibility)--that what makes a great novel great is its shape. The novel starts and sort of hovers at a three, goes down to a one and there's suddenly a climax of six but that climax is only a climax because later on there's a climax of nine. That climax relates to the next climax which is only a six climax with all that bridges in between, sometimes the reader is pulled forward and sometimes it's slow, and the pulse, and then there's a climax of ten and then the book comes to an end that is the symphony the shape, in a novel. A great film which has been edited so that it has a shape--that is the symphony. The various crystallizations of the mind--whether it is the mathematical system or the chess system or the twelve tones or Chinese calligraphy--to deal with these, poetically, to be able to put into words and colors that which we all feel, to be able to connect ourselves and talk about the fears and the loneliness, and the feelings, and the joys, and the longings, that's what human beings are about.

How do they expect little human beings to become big grown-up human beings without this? What the hell do they mean by basic? The arts are basic, they are the most basic, and everything spins from that. The human being is the emotion and the artistic expression of the emotions, then one learns the configurations, and the numbers, one can also learn to add the check book and put together the English sentence in dealing with the arts.

How do we find these gifted children? That's a tough question. What one does with them--the really gifted, I'm talking about the handful in a generation, or maybe not that many--well there has to be some access for these children to be seen or heard or examined by people who know, by artists, by scientists, who understand the nervous system. If there's a great musical talent, several things can happen. He can be watched, be placed with a master; it's very complicated, it means breaking up the family, moving the family--not worth it. But there may be ways in a small community that a family can deal with the very talented child. The importance is that our society should realize that these are the people who are going to lead us. We have so few leaders. The quality of mediocrity which permeates everything except the arts, and certain sciences, the Dating Game mentality, the Gong Show mentality, the television commercial mentality. What's happened to Michaelangelo? What's happened to Mozart?

The greatest scientists, as they examine the universe, and try to describe it to us, find that they often have to use poetic terms. Wheeler, as he examines the cosmos, tells us it's a fugue. Thomas, as he advises NASA is sending out those signals to hypothetical other intelligences, says "don't send out our knowledge of the makeup of the cesium atom" as they were going to do "to show how smart we are;" the first thing he wanted to do was let them know we are here, he says, "then think very carefully what the second thing is." Nixon has already put up there some objects flying in space, which have little graphic pictures of two human beings without genitals. "Send out," he tells us, "send to endless Bach." Endless

Bach. He says, "They'll pardon us for putting our best foot forward." Bach gives a mathematical picture of excellence. Bach deals with the spiritual nature of man, with the emotional nature of man. It is man.

The geneticists, when they examine life, speak of it with awe. It's a mystery.

Philosophy has told us, Eastern religion, once you have reached ten steps on the path, you must lead someone to those ten steps. Judeo-Christian religion, the Rabbi must study. But once he understands he must teach it. He must help. Christianity, the neighbor, to touch other people, to teach--but in this country, "if you can't do, teach!" As Woody Allen says, "If you can't teach, teach gym."

You all know all of this. I offer encouragement. I had to do it on my own. All people have to do it on their own. But if nothing else there could be less of a negative sanction on the arts. I see youth orchestras which are now gaining a positive sanction. These kids date within the orchestra, and they smoke their joints and play Schubert. It's nice. Schubert is in there somewhere. There are cheerleaders with the orchestra--something's happening. A lot of it just came from desperation; they try everything. I've spoken to many teachers who tell me "Look, man. I have enough trouble keeping the needles out of these kids' arms; don't talk to me about music." But in New York, they have those subway cars. And every morning there are spray paint pictures of such an imagination, and at night they take those cars, and they lock them in armed lots, with policemen guarding them and they are restored, but then, nobody knows how, those kids come in with their spray cans, and in the morning there's a new picture. Something is operating there. There is some need, some thirst, that out there "they" may not recognize, but we do. It's up to us. Good luck. Thank you.

Talents: Recognize Their Diversity, or Lose Them

by
Cliff W. Wing, Jr.
Duke University

In March, 1971, the United States Office of Education sent to Congress a report on the "Education of the Gifted and Talented." Procedures for identifying the nation's gifted and talented youth were described as suffering from both "apathy" and "hostility."

Today this country still has clearer, better defined programs, and more energy and money, for identifying and nurturing those with special talents, those most likely to make important contributions to society. No criticism is intended or programs designed to help overcome adversity. On the contrary, they are to be encouraged: An ounce of prevention still is worth a pound of cure.

But recognizing individuals among us with special gifts, and cultivating their talents, may be equally or even more crucial to our health as a people. Even though ferreting out and recognizing certain human talents is harder to do than identifying people with obvious problems, the extra investment of our energies and time may be more than merely desireable; it may be necessary to our society's survival.

We do have a certain amount of institutionalized recognition of some kinds of talent, especially verbal and mathematical aptitude. This is less so of other talents, including artistic gifts, which tend far less to be nurtured by American society.

Is it important to rectify a system that fails to seek out and cultivate as assiduously as possible its most gifted youth? Is it important to assure recognition of a variety of kind of talents, not just a few? To answer these questions, it may be useful to consider human variability and cultural evolution in a biological context.

Human variability is a fact of life. Except for monozygotic twins, no two individuals have identical genic composition. Certainly no two individuals experience the same environment; one cannot be a part of his own environment in the same sense as he is part of that of others. From the interactive crucible of genic and environmental structures, the variability and diversity of human talents are forged. Because the development of talent is interactive, the total diversity of human talent is far greater than the sum of genic and environmental factors.

On most forms of life, nature acts directly to decide what succeeds and what fails. An organism must adapt to the conditions nature provides, or fail; if it fails, its particular biological characteristics are not represented in succeeding generations. If, on the other hand, an organism copes with what nature provides, and if it as well adapts in a way that improves on previous generations' solutions, then that organism is likely to be successful and its biological characteristics are apt to be represented in succeeding generations.

Prepared for the Commissioner's Task Force on the Gifted and Talented of the United States Office of Education. January, 1979.

The diversity and fitness we see in the living world today is generally accepted to be the result of the continuing process of evolution Darwin described as "natural selection." The concept of natural selection provides an analogue for considering the impact of human society's selection and training programs on the diversity and fitness of human talent, and, ultimately, on the evolution of culture.

In a straight biological model of natural selection, the organism survives by adapting directly to what it finds in nature. If great speed and agility are required to catch prey, then nature favors the development of an organism with long legs and high speeds, such as the cheetah. If food is to be found in the treetops, then a giraffe-like structure will be more adaptive for this niche than the bison.

The straight biological view of adaptive behavior may not be applicable to man in the same way; a cultural view of the adaptive process may be needed (Olson, 1976). Humans, through their society, their culture, develop conventions, institutions, artifacts, and technologies which act as buffers between man and direct contacts with nature. Thus, humans interact--adapt or fail to adapt--through the technological creations of their culture. They learn, or do not learn, how to create and master their inventions.

It is those inventions of man which often interact most directly with nature. While the evolutionary process for most life forms involves a nature selecting directly for biological structures representing a better or unique solution to the conditions nature imposes, the evolutionary process for humans -- at least, for human culture -- involves interposing tools or structures outside the body between man and his natural environment. Popper (1972) puts it this way:

> "But man, instead of growing better eyes and ears, grows spectacles, microscopes, telescopes, telephones, and hearing aids. And instead of growing swifter and swifter legs, he grows swifter and swifter motor cars. ...Instead of growing better memories and brains, we grow paper, pens, pencils, typewriters, dictaphones, the printing press, and libraries." (pp. 238-239).

Nor does man grow muscle and brain allowing him to discern by heft the difference between a 10-pound bag of sugar and a 10.1 pound bag. For such a discrimination, he invents the scale. Tests and other selection devices are a form of psychological scale--an invention for weighing aptitude or achievement. And though this scale is far cruder than the crudest balance scale, the higher test-scorer gets the scholarship, just as the swifter cheetah gets the dinner. It becomes very important to consider not only how well or poorly a test or other selection device detects a particular talent, but also what talents are being tested and, ultimately, rewarded.

In the biological model of adaptation, nature is the selector, deciding what traits or talents of the organism are important to cultivate so that those characteristics are more likely to be represented in future generations. By contrast, in the cultural model of adaptation, a major role in selection is given to man's artifacts and institutions. Society says which traits are important, which gifted performances shall be applauded, what the rewards for each kind of talent will be, and how individual members of society will be enabled to develop their talents--even whether they are to be cultivated at all. Nature shapes the evolutionary course

of all forms of life, but cultural inventions shape the evolution of man's society, foreshadowing which human talents will be represented.

Natural selection as a biological system is as old as life itself. Selection as a human cultural phenomenon is relatively of very recent origin. If there is merit in considering the evolution of culture as analogous (perhaps imperfectly, but nonetheless meaningfully) with biological evolution, then we should have much to learn about the cultivation of human talent from studying principles governing natural selection.

One observation of special interest is that in nature, life in a given geographical area is more adaptive, more successful, if there are many highly diversified forms of life than where there are fewer forms and less diversification. Success in adaptiveness is associated not only with richness in the number of life forms represented but also with their being evenly represented across forms: That is, two censuses of life forms could be equally rich in the number of different species represented, but the one where all forms were represented in about equal force would be more adaptive than the one where a few forms dominated in number and the rest were represented only in token fashion.

It may be supposed that great diversity, evenly distributed, worked well in nature because there are many areas for competition--one for each of many life forms--and therefore many opportunities to excel. The fastest cheetah and the tallest giraffe both eat well. With fewer forms of life and the same total number of individuals, there is less opportunity for success: All must compete in the same game, only a few can excel in their class, and the proportion of average and failing individuals must increase.

The same principles of rich diversity evenly distributed may well be worth embracing as principles to be emulated when culture, rather than nature, shapes the selection process. To succeed, society must, like nature, attend to and recognize a great many forms of talent, or lose in adaptive capability. To assure representation of all these many forms of talent in future generations, society must assure that these forms are not merely represented, but represented in substantial numbers. If, among two hundred million people, there are only two kinds of talent recognized, then there may be one hundred million people in each competition for excellence. Along these two scales, most people will be average or failures. If there are instead two hundred characteristics earmarked as worthwhile enough to be called "talent," there will be the chance for the top percentages in each of two hundred contests to emerge as excellent (the more so to the degree that success in one arena is not related to success in the others; that is, the clearer the delineation among talent categories); and consequently (a) fewer average or failing individuals, and (b) more successful talents to pass along to the future.

When society does not identify or cultivate a number of potentially important talents, it probably risks the under-representation of these characteristics in future generations of society. Increasing numbers of individuals will compete in decreasing number of talent classes, so that more and more fail, fewer and fewer excel. The price may be paid not only in unadaptive, overly competitive, overstressed societies, but also perhaps, by a narrowing of the capacity to deal with nature itself, which may well operate on infinite diversity.

It may be that human society's durability is intertwined with its ability to foster diversity.

Just how well do our current procedures for identifying and cultivating talent work to promote diversity? Answers to the question will vary depending upon the age group being considered. For youngsters of school age, there is evidence indicating that our procedures tend to promote only a few talents rather than a variety. Beyond the normal age levels of the formal education system, society probably promotes the development of more kinds of talent.

In a world of formal education, we often have more information about the number of testing instruments for identifying talent that have been sold than about how they have been used. In an effort to determine how college entrance tests are used in making admission decisions, Wing and Wallach (1971) studied records at a group of selective colleges associated with the identification and training of this nation's most "talented" youth. It was learned that the decisions to admit or not to admit, in this, one of the nation's most influential selection systems, could be predicted quite accurately from a very simple, two-variable model: Scholastic Aptitude test scores and high school grades. These two variables, highly intercorrelated with each other, measure essentially one sort of human talent, namely academic ability. Measurement of this particular kind of talent, through the two variables, accounted overwhelmingly for the accuracy of the authors' model in predicting the decisions of the admissions committees.

This 1971 study took into account measures of other talents besides academic ability. Using the concept of public accomplishments (rather than a paper-and-pencil test) as a measure of such other talents, the authors assessed the applying students' talents for poetry and science and artistic ability and leadership, among other talents, by counting accomplishments judged as noteworthy by our society. Thus, an applicant whose poetry had been selected for publication was credited with some talent for poetry; a National Science Foundation award meant the student was considered to have special gifts in science; inclusion of her painting in a local shop led to counting that applicant was talented in the visual arts; and being president of the student body was considered indication of leadership ability.

The authors added the "accomplishment" evidence of these non-academic talents to the formula predicting the admit/reject decisions of the admissions committees and found no improvement over predictions based on the two measures of academic ability alone. This meant that admissions decisions were being made with no perceptible attention being paid to talents except for the talent measured by scores on college entrance tests and by school grades. Other talents (however imperfectly they may have been measured by the public accomplishment "test") obviously were not being considered in the decision-making process about whom to admit and whom to reject. Thus the overwhelming evidence was that in the highly prestigious colleges attracting an important segment of our youth, selection was based on a very narrow definition of talent; a diversity of talents was not being considered. There is little reason to believe that most of these undergraduate admissions programs have changed significantly in the past several years.

The major justification for relying on intelligence test scores and other measures of academic talent in the admissions process has been that such measures predict college grades with reasonable accuracy. But what are

college grades related to? Recent research indicates that college grades are not related to talented achievements after college. If colleges are supposed to prepare people for superior attainments in life, should we not be using selectors for college that are predictive not just of college grades but, more importantly, of later accomplishments? Should we not broaden our conception of human talent so that those selected for privileged educational opportunities are identified on the basis of talents likely to be related to career accomplishments recognized by society outside the education world?

College admissions is not the only available illustration of our society's rather simplistic approaches to selecting and training of its talented youth. Professional schools, such as those of medicine and law, place heavy emphasis on tests and grades for selection purposes. One wonders what effect this narrowing view of talent has on the characteristics of the professionals produced. Is the effect homogenizing? Could the uneven demographic distribution of physicians have anything to do with the manner of their selection? Test scores are correlated with urban/rural differences and ghetto/suburban differences. The rural and ghetto areas do not produce their share of high test scorers, nor do they have their share of doctors.

If grades and test scores are the only things we have, up to now, been able to agree to use in identifying the talented, it appears that, to diversify our approach, we shall have to consciously identify and cultivate other talents. How do we get from where we are to where we might agree we ought to go? I have some guesses.

First, we have to agree to look at competencies outside the test scores/grade domain. We have to agree, for example, that dance and poetry are important talents to cultivate in our society, and that people with those talents should be regularly included, in meaningful numbers, in various winners' circles.

We need to see that people who are qualified as experts in dance and poetry are trained to make judgments about the talents of others, so that judgments are offered on a consistent basis. We need not the promissory note of paper and pencil tests but the routine screening of candidates for the winners' circles by the various experts to recognize each talent. This does not mean that we throw away test scores and grades--they do indicate an important talent. It does mean giving equal or even greater weight to the experts' judgments which form the basis for selecting people with other talents.

Our selection process probably needs to seek out talent earlier than most programs do now. Selecting at the junior high level might be workable.

To include a wide variety of talents, a holistic selection plan must be embraced. The effort to increase the number of talents for which we select is too enormous to be undertaken initially at a national level. Our beginnings should be to select for the full panoply at local community or county levels.

Finally--and this is not a guess--we must carefully research our new selection procedures and their impact. During the past many years, most of our educational procedures, including the far-reaching selection procedures, of our educational institutions, have been developed more on the basis of fad and fashion than on thoughtful research. As we grope toward the more

highly diversified society, we must study our ways of getting there. Are they effective? Do they work to diversify talent, in fact? We must say clearly what we do and how. Only then may future generations be able to study the question of how talent diversity relates to the success of society. Or whether in fact it does at all.

References

Olson, David R. Culture, Technology and Intellect. In Lauren B. Resnick (Ed.), The Nature of Intelligence. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Associates, 1976.

Popper, K.R. Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

U. S. Commissioner of Education Report to the Congress. Education of the Gifted and Talented. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Wing, Cliff W. Jr. and Wallach, Michael A. College Admissions and the Psychology of Talent. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Indentification of Musically Talented Students

by
Dr. Robert G. Petzold
University of Wisconsin

Although interest in the gifted child may well have been stimulated by the publication, in 1869, of Sir Francis Galton's Hereditary Genius, extensive study of giftedness did not occur until the early decades of the twentieth century. The development of standardized intelligence tests provided one widely accepted criterion for identifying children with high abstract intelligence and the many research studies generated by Terman's Genetic Studies of Genius have provided considerable information relating to the backgrounds, physical, psychological and social characteristics and behaviors of intellectually gifted children. The research consistently showed that persons who had been identified as intellectually or academically gifted also possessed many other talents, and almost thirty years ago Witty suggested that dependence upon an intelligence or achievement test score might prove inadequate for the identification of children whose outstanding abilities could be recognized chiefly by their performance.

> "Perhaps it is desirable to broaden our definition of the gifted and to consider any child as 'gifted' whose performance, in a valuable line of human activity, is consistently or repeatedly remarkable.... It would be desirable to refer to all types of so-called gifted children as potentially gifted since a number of characteristics are necessary for a child to reveal or demonstrate his 'giftedness.'"[1]

This broader definition is reflected in books and articles authored recently by psychologists, child psychologists, and educational psychologists that contain some discussion of the gifted and talented (or exceptional) child. However, much of their attention continues to focus primarily on the "academically talented" student, presumably because there appears to be general agreement that identification of the academically talented/intellectually gifted poses fewer problems than those encountered in identifying the creative or artistically/musically talented student. In his 1971 Report to Congress, the U.S. Commissioner of Education defined gifted and talented children to include those with special talents and creativity as well as those with intellectual and academic giftedness, and also favored multiple means for identification. Although 1950 marked the beginning of a considerable increase in the amount of research concerned with creativity, creative thinking, and/or creative processes, no similar increase can be noted with respect to musical/artistic talent.

For many years, educational decision makers have periodically issued position statements supporting the importance of meeting the educational needs of gifted and talented students. Referring to recent studies, the Commissioner of Education decried the present status of provisions for the gifted and talented, concluding that: (1) existing services were available to only a very small percentage of the gifted and talented population generally; (2) differentiated education for the gifted and talented was perceived as a very low priority at all levels of government and of educational adminstration; and (3) identification of the gifted is hampered not only by the costs of appropriate testing, but also by apathy and even hostility among teachers, administrators, and other educational personnel.[2]

Responsibility for establishing programs for the gifted and talented, however such programs may be defined, is clearly at the local school district level and the priorities of that district, together with financial, staffing, and administrative problems encountered in developing a program for the gifted often which make it impossible to seriously consider meeting the needs of this special group of students. In the absence of any clearly formulated program effort, the gifted and talented student is often "left alone," or given specialized attention and guidance by some individual teacher. The balance of this paper will focus on two major questions: (1) Who are the musically talented students? and (2) What can be done to help the musically talented student realize his/her full potential?

Who are the musically talented students?

It is relatively easy to identify those few individuals who have attained recognition as outstanding performers, composers, or conductors and to trace this to some evidence of giftedness that may have emerged fairly early in their lives, as in the case of the child prodigy. It is less easy to identify the potential for talent that exists in a given individual so the needs of that individual can be taken into account as we deal with him/her in the school music program. Despite the unusual interest of psychologists and musicians in identifying musical talent, or musicality, that spans several decades, we have not yet achieved a uniform and functional understanding of the term. In part, this is the consequence of differences between test developers in the psychological constructs used in defining the dimensions of talent, aptitude, musical ability, musical capacity, and musical achievement as individuals make reference to musical giftedness. Colwell states that "there appear to be several kinds of musical talent or several facets to it, such as talent for performance, for composition, for musicological research, for conducting, and perhaps listening."[3] He also indicates that it is difficult to separate aptitude from achievment because certain aspects of musical development are difficult to measure until the child is somewhat more mature, at which time additional learning or achievement has occurred.

The appearance, in 1919, of the Seashore Measures of Musical Talent generated considerable argument and discussion regarding music aptitude tests that has not yet been resolved. Seashore and others took an "atomistic" approach to test development based on the idea that overall musical aptitude was a compositive of several mutually exclusive aspects of aptitude, each of which could be measured independently. Others based their tests on the "Gestalt" or "omnibus" theory of aptitude or musicality, implying some musically all-inclusive trait which, although having component parts, is to be evaluated in totality. It is obviously beyond the scope and purpose of this paper to summarize either the research which deals with musical aptitude or the arguments that have been raised regarding the validity or reliability of a particular test. There appears to be a general agreement that musical aptitude (capacity or potential for musical achievement) includes those musical traits or qualities that develop over a lengthy period of time, are present in varying amount from individual to individual, and may cease to improve with further training and musical experience after a certain age. The general dimensions of aptitude probably include sensitivity to pitch and intonation, tonal and rhythmic imagery and memory, and musical sensitivity. Sensitivity, because it is more preference-oriented as it is presently measured, reflects the probable influence of training and experience while memory is also a dimension that can be improved with training, even though it is a component of

many music aptitude tests.

Musical achievement, or musical ability, is generally interpreted to refer to those skills, competencies, concepts and knowledge, and understandings that are learned or acquired through training. Consequently, achievement may be much easier to assess and evaluate than music aptitude, especially in the areas of musical performance and musical knowledge. It is reasonable to take the position that musical talent is the result of an interaction between musical aptitude, however measured, and musical achievement, together with other personal and psychological traits that also appear to be present in the musically talented student. Some of the factors commonly associated with being musically talented deserve brief mention.

The relationship between scores on intelligence and academic achievement tests is, as might be expected, quite high. Although the relationship between intelligence and music aptitude is positive, it is also quite low, while the relationship between general intelligence and musical achievement and performance is somewhat higher. Regardless of the "folklore" that suggests it may be possible to identify students for special music instruction on the basis of intelligence and academic achievement, this would be a dubious practice. It is highly probable, were we to adequately assess cognitive learning in music, that higher correlations between intelligence and music achievement would emerge. However, if we are attempting to identify the truly musically talented student rather than the "above average" student, further research may produce significantly higher correlations between music aptitude, musical achievement, and general intelligence and academic achievement than the correlations obtained in research to date.

There is no evidence to indicate that race, nationality, inheritance, and sex are systematically associated with musical aptitude. At the same time, social and environmental factors evident in culturally disadvantaged students exert considerable influence on music attainment or achievement, but not upon music aptitude.

With respect to certain other psychological factors such as interest in music, personal preference for musical activities, motivation and drive, self-discipline, dedication to working toward a goal, and self-realization there is no evidence of any relationship to musical aptitude. However, and this comes as not a surprise to most music teachers, all of these have considerable bearing upon musical achievement and attainment, particularly for the musically talented individual. Objective research studies have provided no basis for suggesting that the creative, gifted musician is any more, or less, neurotic, unstable, extroverted, or introverted than peers in the same or other fields of endeavor. Interested readers will find a more extensive discussion of music aptitude and achievement in Colwell[4] and Gordon.[5]

In summary, the musically talented student is expected to possess outstanding musical aptitude and to demonstrate significant achievement in music. Certain information can be obtained by using reliable and valid standardized tests. In the case of younger children for whom such tests may be inappropriate or unavailable, the experienced professional will need to make certain judgments on the basis of observing the musical behaviors of the child within the classroom setting. It should be obvious that no single standardized test score is sufficient to serve as a basis for identifying the musically talented student, some evidence of <u>both</u> aptitude

and achievement are desirable. In addition to test scores, if available, there should be positive evidence of superior performance ability, or potential for such performance, that is appropriate to the instructional level (elementary, middle school, high school) at which the screening is carried forward. One would also expect the truly talented student to possess those personal and psychological characteristics associated with musical achievement, and to be of above-average intelligence. All schools, at all grade levels, have many students who could be identified as "above-average in musical potential." However, we should be concerned with those who fall within the upper five to ten percent of the group, not those who are in the upper half or upper 25 percent of the population. It is the potential for excellence that is sought, not the potential for being above average. When a multi-dimensional approach issued by professionals, the probability of successfully identifying the "musically talented" student is significantly increased.

What can be done to help the musically talented student realize his/her full potential?

Many music educators believe that the typical music program, at least at the secondary school level, already meets the needs of the musically talented student. Not only do these programs offer beginning, intermediate, and advanced classes in various performance areas, but these organizations are supplemented by solo and ensemble activities and, in some schools, by special classes in music theory, composition, arranging, conducting, and music history and literature. For years, conscientious and dedicated music educators have been deeply concerned with identifying students who possessed above-average musical talent, encouraging them to further develop their talents, and attempting to provide worthwhile and challenging musical experiences for them as part of the regular school program. Unfortunately, full teaching schedules, inordinately large pupil-teacher ratios, inadequate physical facilities, the relative inflexibility of student schedules, and many other factors have always seemed to stand in the way of fully realizing this goal.

Music has been an accepted component of the elementary school curriculum since 1838, when the Primary School Board of Boston gave Lowell Mason the authority to launch a full-scale program in that city. During the 140 years that have passed since that landmark event, music programs have become an integral part of every elementary and secondary school in the United States, committed to providing for the musical needs and interests of all students while also giving attention to those who are musically talented. A report[6] prepared by the National Center for Educational Statistics surveyed the 1972-73 offerings and enrollments in 22,737 secondary schools, grade 7 through 12, showed: (1) 91.7 percent of these schools offered choir and/or chorus classes, (2) 83 percent offered band, and (3) 25 percent offered orchestra. Since the survey also included junior high schools with grades 7-8, many of which may not have bands and orchestras as such, the figures may be somewhat misleading. It is doubtful that there is any high school, grades 9-12, that does not have at least a band and a chorus. This report also showed that almost 25 percent of the total high school population, grades 9-12, was enrolled in one or more music classes, with bands and choruses serving approximately ten percent of the total high school population. Unofficial estimates from the American Symphony Orchestra League suggest that there are between 125 and 200 youth symphony orchestras in the United States, all of which include high school students. These orchestras are organized outside the usual music program of the schools

under varying sponsoring groups, but all provide additional opportunities for talented youth.

The Music Educators National Conference, a professional organization for persons engaged in music teaching or other music educational work, has grown from an initial membership of 104 when founded as the Music Supervisors National Conference in 1907, to 65,000. Throughout the years, this organization has provided leadership for the improvement and expansion of music education programs. For example, in 1926 the National Band Contest was organized, a movement that has since grown so musically talented students in every state have opportunities to have their performance objectively evaluated, by professional musicians using standard adjudication forms, at district and state music contests and festivals. The formation, also in 1926, of the National High School Orchestra composed of high school musicians selected on the basis of an audition has led to the organization of all-state honors orchestras, bands, and choirs with members selected by audition. These kinds of efforts to provide for the musically talented students have been supported by similar efforts of the Music Teachers National Association, an organization of private music teachers that was founded in 1876.

Music contests and festivals, all-state groups, and a growing tendency to over-emphasize public performance have been subjected to much criticism. Critics claim, among other things, that these are un-democratic, fail to meet the educational and/or musical needs of <u>all</u> students, and result in an exclusive or "elitist" character of many performance groups and music programs. Such criticisms cannot be dealt with in this paper, although they do bear upon the major issue of the musically talented student.

Several years ago, Pressey identified certain conditions favorable to the development of talent that have implications for all teachers:

1. A prevalent cultural interest in the field.
2. Exceptional early opportunity and encouragement to develop the ability.
3. Superior individual guidance and instruction beginning at an early age.
4. Opportunities to use the special abilities as they develop.
5. Association with others interested in the field.
6. The stimulation of many successes, for which the individual gains recognition.

At the same time, care must be taken to prevent the talented child from being discouraged by the antagonism of his/her peers. In view of the acceptance of music as a viable social and cultural activity, most music programs meet some of the conditions suggested by Pressey.

At the elementary school level, particularly the early grade, the music teacher can identify the child gifted in music by the child's early responses to rhythm and melody, by performance in singing, and/or by the ease with which the child acquires expertise in playing some musical instrument. As the child becomes older and has more exposure to music, it becomes possible to assess music reading skill, facility in rhythmic movement, creative potential, musical knowledge, interest and attitude. Some schools regularly administer certain standardized aptitude and/or achievement tests in music and, if the test scores are used to improve and modify instructional programs for students, these can be valuable sources of additional informa-

tion despite their cost in time and money. Much is being done, by individual teachers and by publishers of instructional materials, to "individualize" instruction for the talented student. Greater flexibility of scheduling music classes, opportunity for grouping students on the basis of musical ability, facilities to accommodate students on an individual and small group basis to pursue projects of a more advanced nature, together with provision for specialized music activities which challenge the musically talented student are other ways in which the music teacher may be able to influence school administrators who support differentiated education for the gifted. Above all, the music teacher should continue to recognize the significance of the out-of-school musical activities of the student such as private lessons, dancing classes, concert attendance, and participation in youth choirs. Frequent communication with parents of children who appear to be potentially gifted in music may serve to emphasize the unique talents of these children which parents may be able to nurture and support.

At the secondary school level, the extent to which the needs of the musically gifted student can be met depends, in part, on the nature and diversity of the instructional offerings in music. A small school with one or two music teachers is not in a position to offer the variety of performance groups and other kinds of classes possible for larger schools. Music teachers in our secondary schools have, for years, given attention to the talented student as they hold auditions for membership in the major performance groups, select students for solo and ensemble performances, participate in music contests and festivals, recommend students for scholarships to summer music camps and clinics, and reward students for outstanding contributions to the music program. However, in all too many situations, the range of abilities, even in the advanced group, is so great that many of the talented are not sufficiently challenged because of the amount of time required to help the less-talented members of the group master the music.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is impossible, at this time, to describe specific actions that should be taken by local, state, and Federal education agencies, respectively, or even to offer valid recommendations. However, the following are examples of the kinds of questions that may warrant consideration:

1. Does this school system have an organized program for the gifted and talented? If not, does it encourage and support teachers in their efforts to provide differentiated education?

2. Does the school district sponsor workshops and/or inservice sessions for teachers that focus on the education of the gifted and talented?

3. Do children in this elementary school have regularly scheduled music classes taught by a qualified music teacher?

4. What criteria, other than performance skill, are used to identify the musically talented student?

5. What special provisions does the music program offer to stimulate and encourage those with talent to learn more about music and music making?

6. What efforts do you, and other music techers in the system, make to identify and work with musically talented students who may not be members of a performance group?

7. Are private teachers of piano, voice, and other instruments readily accessible to students whose interests and abilities appear to warrant specialized instruction? Are funds available to permit disadvantaged students with talent to study with a private teacher?

8. Are facilities and other resources available so talented students have opportunities to learn conducting and score-reading, to conduct rehearsals, to compose and/or arrange music and have their music performed, to study music theory and music history, and/or to participate in year-round solo and ensemble activities?

American music education has flourished because the musical abilities of students have been recognized, encouraged, and developed by the music teachers in the schools, working closely with parents and private teachers. Although the excellence of our performance groups is but one testimonial of the concern for music and the musically talented, we must not lose sight of our commitment to <u>both</u> the talented and the less-talented. We need to extend and refine our procedures in order to tap that hidden reservoir of musical talent present in every school and community.

Footnotes

[1]P. Witty, "Who are the Gifted?", Education for the Gifted, 57th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 55.

[2]Education of the Gifted and Talented, Volume 1: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U. S. Commissioner of Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 3.

[3]R. Colwell, The Evaluation of Music Teaching and Learning, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 72.

[4]R. Colwell, The Evaluation of Music Teaching and Learning, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

[5]E. Gordon, The Psychology of Music Teaching, (Englewood Cliffs,N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971).

[6]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Summary of Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1972-1973, by Logan Osterndorf, National Center for Educational Statistics Report No. 76-150 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975).

[7]S. L. Pressey, "Concerning the Nature and Nurture of Genius", Scientific Monthly, LXXXI (September, 1955), pp. 123-129.

A Statement for the Office of Gifted and Talented

by
Charles M. Dorn, Professor
Art and Design
Purdue University

There is probably no greater concern among secondary school arts educators than the one of achieving national recognition for talented and gifted arts students enrolled in U.S. secondary schools. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that recognition of excellence seems so readily available to students in the cognitive subject areas, i.e., science, math, English, and history. This is particularly evident in the school system's general acceptance of the procedures used for the identification of the National Merit Scholars and for the selection of the Presidential Scholars.

That high school students as "scholars" are readily identifiable in the nation's secondary schools and that their arts counterparts are not, is not wholly because those concerned with the identification of the gifted and talented do not care. In fact, part of the problem rests with the very art educators who are most concerned with this seeming inequity. The fact is that arts educators do not like making judgments of any kind about the creative efforts of young people lacking full maturation and a maximum level of training and education in the arts discipline. Those in the cognitive subject areas, i.e., math, science, etc., long accustomed to norm-referenced testing in schools, find it extremely hard to identify with the kinds of self-doubts besetting most arts educators about the evaluation process.

The facts are, however, until recently not much attention has been paid to the assessment of adolescent artistic excellence. Beyond measures of technical excellence in a well-crafted performance, little has been done to look at the holistic problem of estimating the student's potential for artistic achievement. This is due, in part, to the fact that the arts, as already indicated, have no norm-referenced measures available and in part to the profession's unwillingness to look beyond performance itself, i.e., the potential for giftedness as manifested in a variety of behaviors associated with the developing young artist. Stated in feeling terms, art educators are individually quite sure of what it takes to "make it," while still remaining reticent to put these subjective "feeling" judgments into a set of evaluative criteria useful for identifying giftedness in the arts.

Over the past twenty years, a number of abortive efforts have been made by educators and leaders in government to identify gifted and talented students in the arts. The efforts of President Lyndon Johnson in the sixties is, I think, typical of the kinds of frustration both sides have experienced. Convinced that the President should recognize the artistic as well as the academically talented in the Presidential Scholars program, Johnson's "academic" advisor was directed to invite arts educators to meet at U.S.O.E. for a weekend to assist the President in outlining appropriate criteria for identifying artistically talented students for the Presidential Scholars program. Typical of a field "united by its doubts and divided by its convictions," the educators, artists, and scholars gathered "agreed to disagree," and the effort failed for the lack of consensus about what should be done.

What happened at U.S.O.E. was of course no different than what was happening at the hearings for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 in which the artists continued their bickering, and only the humanists who could talk coherently and bargain effectively saved the day. Certainly it could be said of those trying times that nobody in the arts was together, and there was indeed no forum, such as the NEA, NEH, or Arts Council, that would make it possible for arts educators to share mutual concerns for the education of young people in the arts. Considering this was also the time McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation declared that artists couldn't be educated even in the university, much less in the secondary school, it's not surprising these efforts most often ended in failure.

Johnson's O.E. meeting also wasn't the only sixties effort; there was also the attempt of Kerry Smith, Executive Director of the Association of Higher Education, then a division of the National Education Association. Smith, a believer but not an art educator, received a small grant from Roger Stevens, then Chairman of the National Council for the Arts, to look at the whole question of college admission procedures which recognized scholarly but not artistic ability as criteria for admission to higher education. Smith, convinced by Louis Mayhew of Stanford that tests of creativity might provide a solution to the problem, ultimately faced a no-support declaration form the testing establishment and a no-matching of monies response from the foundations which ended that project. In those days everyone cared, but no one in high places seemed to listen.

Fortunately during the late sixties, a new effort attracted the attention of Kathyrn Bloom, then Director of U.S.O.E.'s Office of the Arts and Humanities. The concept was to develop tests capable of measuring the artistic performance of secondary students for the purposes of advanced placement in universities, colleges, and arts schools. This program, ultimately funded by U.S.O.E., the JDR III fund, and the N.E.A., resulted in the College Entrance Examination Board's program for Advanced Placement in Studio Art, Art History, and Music. These programs, now in their eighth year of operation, currently are facilitating the efforts of several thousand high school students to obtain college credits for art study completed at the high school level. Of particular relevance to the issue of evaluating talented high school artistic performances is the current program in Studio Art. What is unique about this program is its success in quantitatively judged as being equivalent to beginning college work by some 1000 institutions of higher education. The AP "examination," which evaluates both originals and color slides of art works using six judges in a controlled situation, is a unique effort in arts evaluation. Its growing acceptance by both secondary and college art educators is increasing evidence that arts performances can be evaluated through procedures acceptable to both secondary and postsecondary educators. My own personal involvement and the involvement of a number of other professional artists and educators in this program leads me to propose that the AP studio model could be adapted for use at a national level to identify and select secondary students for recognition in several of the arts. It is my contention that such a model provides evaluation procedures both acceptable to arts educators and capable of yielding estimates useful for the identification of students deserving special artistic recognition at the national level. To achieve this end, I would recommend the construction of several arts evaluation procedures under the following conditions:

1. That these evaluations be comprehensive and based on evidence of both the student's artistic performance (craft) and of his/her

artistic problem solving ability.

Comprehensiveness is, I believe, the key to effectively evaluating adolescent student artistic ability. No single studio work or performance is in and of itself a sufficient indicator of artistic potential. Any viable evaluation must provide a broad range of examples of a student's skill in performance and in imaginative thinking. This is especially important in estimating the abilities of the young artist who is on the way but is not, as yet, an accomplished adult artist. While maturation as an artist will vary in accordance with the very special character of each individual art, the evidence provided for judgment should provide both expressive and cognitive estimates of the total performance of the students.

2. That these evaluations be based on a criterion referenced model applied by arts educators and professional artists trained to provide competent, valid, and reliable judgments of student artistic abilities.

Since there are no absolute standards which can be set for judging artistic excellence, and especially so for adolescents, evaluative criteria should be set to discriminate between several levels of achievement in relation to what might be described as a grade 13 level of performance. In standard setting, it is strongly recommended that a single national judging of all applicants be accomplished and that performance levels be based on the actual levels of performances exhibited by the participating students. Again, no absolute levels of artistic excellence are in all probability attainable, though valid rankings of performance can be achieved using competent judges adequately trained in appropriate evaluation methods.

3. That the evaluations and the procedures used for their administration be cooperatively and openly developed by arts educators, practicing artists, and test developers for the purpose of receiving general field support of these arts examinations.

For the evaluations to be accepted by both educators and professionals in the arts, it is extremely important that as many professional groups as possible have access to full participation in the development of the evaluation process. While it is not possible for everyone concerned with the evaluation of secondary school arts performance to actually develop the test, key representatives from the major constituencies being served can be involved. To the extent possible, as many practitioners as is feasible should also be involved in reacting to the evaluation design. Without a strong support base from the field, little credence will be given to the evaluation as a mechanism for the identification of artistically gifted and talented students.

4. That the evaluation be made available to all secondary school youth through the aegis of the secondary school in which the student is enrolled.

It is extremely important that all secondary arts students have as easy an access to the arts examination procedure as the

academically superior student has to the school administered Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). While institutions outside of the school can and should be used to assist in the identification of gifted and talented students, the principal responsibility for selection and processing of students for the evaluation should rest within the adminstrative structure already available in U.S. secondary schools. To allow private groups, i.e., arts councils, private arts schools, or other special interest groups in the arts to be the primary or sole agents for the identification of talented students would considerably bias both the process of identification and the process of accepting judgements made by the evaluators.

5. That a national testing agency be employed to supervise the administration of these national evaluations under the supervision of a national board of examiners nominated by the various professional organizations in each art area.

   No presently existing arts organization is in a position to administer a test which could conceivably involve some 15,000 school districts. Besides lacking the expertise in test construction and administration, arts organizations, both private and governmental, lack appropriate linkages with the existing secondary school structure, it is therefore recommended that an existing test agency, such as the Educational Testing Service which also administers the SAT examination, be the principal mechanism for administration of the examinations. ETS, for example, now develops content specifications for test and evaluations in a large variety of disciplines including art and music. They are able to do this by working with committees who are recommended by professional organizations and other responsible outside agencies. Selecting an experienced testing agency with a proven track record of working with both professional groups and Federal and private agencies is essential to the development of an arts field responsive evaluation program. Knowing how to set up and work with a committee system which can provide feedback both to the arts disciplines and to other responsible agencies is extremely critical to the development of any national arts evaluation effort.

In order to facilitate the development of these arts examinations, I am suggesting that the concerned groups take the following actions:

1. The Federal Government (U.S.O.E.)

   That the appropriate agency within the Office of Education organize and support an initial development of evaluation procedures in each art area. This effort should involve representatives from the various professional groups and representatives of the testing agency selected by U.S.O.E. to administer the examination. Participants in the test development meeting should include secondary teachers and administrators, college teachers, and practicing artists who are interested in developing procedures for identifying gifted and talented arts students at the secondary level.

2. The Arts Organizations

Should immediately nominate individuals to represent constituent concerns in the construction of an arts examination procedure at the secondary level. The individuals selected by the various organizations should hold a preliminary meeting of the committee for developing evaluation procedures to lay out fundamental concerns in the identification and examination of exceptional students in the particular art form. Some agreements regarding the general parameters of the examination should be developed by this group prior to the actual attempt to develop the details of the testing procedure.

3. State Departments of Education and Local School Systems

Efforts should begin by these agencies to test the reactions and concerns of school administrators, arts supervisors, and arts teachers at the local level with regard to the development of national examinations in arts for gifted and talented students. Suggestions and concerns expressed in the meetings of these groups should be forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education for transmittal to test development committees.

The Arts for Gifted and Talented Students

A Paper

By Staff Members of Several of the Major National Associations
on Behalf of the Assembly of National Arts Education Organizations

Roles for Professional Arts Educators

INTRODUCTION

This paper is organized to address its topic on two levels. The first part deals with the local context emphasizing issues faced by professional arts educators in their work at the school level. The second part deals with the national context by emphasizing the capabilities of national professional arts education associations to be effective in working to alleviate some of the problems discussed in part one.

Although the paper describes problems from a particular point of view, it is understood that the problems and challenges outlined are common between arts specialists and gifted and talented specialists. Appropriate involvement by the associations could assist the development of common solutions.

I. The Arts Educator and the Local Gifted and Talented Program

For many years leaders of organizations that advocate, promote and support the development of special programs in the schools for gifted students have posed one pervasive question to leaders of state and national associations of professional arts education specialists. "Why won't the high school band director participate effectively as a resource member of the faculty/parent/community group that is developing programs for gifted students in our school system?" This question has been asked constantly in different variations applying to others with comparable role responsibilities such as the high school drama coach, the physical education teacher who has a special interest and training in dance and the junior high school art teacher.

The fact that the question continues to be asked is important for a number of reasons. Many school arts education specialists apparently do not participate as resource support for local groups organizing programs for gifted students in ways that other educators, parents and community leaders expect. Since the question is addressed to leaders of national associations of school arts education professionals, leaders of the gifted student movement seem to be indicating that the national associations should be exercising a leadership responsibility that is not now being provided. It becomes increasingly hard to defend arts education programs in the curriculum if arts education specialists seem to be ignoring the needs of special groups of students--particularly when the support for the schools from the community is focussed acutely on the needs of gifted students. Numbers of questions arise from this large set of circumstances:

1. Is the pervasive question an accurate indicator of the lack of support by school arts specialists?

2. If it is accurate, why does the situation exist as it does?

3. What is the responsibility of the national associations of arts specialists?

4. What kinds of activities should they be undertaking to remedy the situation?

If we assume for present purposes that there is a sound basis for the charge against school arts education specialists, and if this charge finds its way into print, it may well stimulate many school arts education specialists to deny the allegation. This may be done by making references to their own experience or the experience of others which clearly does demonstrate with specific evidence that school arts teachers are indeed actively and effectively participating in local gifted student programs.

This sort of evidence is badly needed by the national arts education organizations both for dissemination to their members and to the national, state and local organizations that provide leadership for gifted student programs.

If there are school art or music or drama or dance specialists who are actively involved with the gifted student programs in their school systems, notice of their activity should be sent to the appropriate national professional association by writing one of the persons whose names appear below:

John Mahlmann
Executive Director
National Art Education Association
1916 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Marjorie Blaufarb
Director of Public Affairs
National Dance Association
1202 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jack Morrison
Executive Director
American Theatre Association
1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Charles O. Moody
Director of Development
Music Educators National Conference
1902 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

If there are participants in a local, regional or state level gifted student program who know of cases where arts education specialists have contributed regularly and significantly, they should identify those programs in communication to the national arts education organizations.

Should the response to this request be overwhelming then the charge against school arts education specialists can be laid to rest once and for all. It can then join many of the other shibboleths that have come to infest the folklore about education in the schools of America.

However, if the charge is accurate, there is need to consider some of the possible reasons. An annotated list of possible reasons is given below:

1. "I work with artistically gifted and talented students; how can I be accused of failing to support the gifted student program?"

When this is the response, and it frequently is, some translation is needed. The arts educator's professional career is committed to identifying and cultivating the artistically talented student. The high school counselor has traditionally attacked the high school band director because the able student of music is encouraged to become ever more proficient as a performer. Third or fourth year art in the high school curriculum is frequently thought of as a screening experience to identify prospective enrollees for professional art schools. High school drama coaches are committed to early identification of the interested, committed and talented youngsters who can and will play leads effectively when they are upper classmen. That drama coach is absolutely ecstatic when a student talent appears that can be developed to play character roles with some insight and feeling.

If the point is pushed far enough many arts education specialists will respond by asserting with truth that the more conventionally organized gifted student programs are based upon identification procedures that make no accommodation for the artistically talented student. Arts educators may then defend their lack of participation in such programs on the basis that a major constituent of the gifted and talented population would get no special support from the program in the schools were it not for opportunities offered by the arts classes.

2. "How, within reason, can I be expected to make a greater commitment than I am already making?"

The school arts specialist in the secondary school is commonly preoccupied with a performance or demonstration activity. Student artists need recognition. They need recognition for excellence in performance. Teachers of the arts also need recognition. They need recognition both as artists and as teachers. If the art form is based upon performance then the teacher trained as an artist needs to demonstrate ability as a conductor, as a choreographer, as a producer and director, as a manager and as a gallery or exhibit organizer. To be able to do that successfully requires many hours of extra time for rehearsals, practice, and organization. It also requires extraordinary help from parents, community sources and school administrators. It requires enlisting and organizing support from many students who are not performers or student artists, but whose principal responsibility is to provide the support necessary for effective performances and presentations. Usually arts educators are far more visible in the community

than most other educators. The community makes judgments about their effectiveness as teachers based upon visible evidence publicly shared in a way similar only to the performance of athletic coaches. Moreover, arts educators usually encourage their more able students to participate in the many activities which they organize and conduct to challenge, stimulate and provide recognition through regional and state-wide competition. All these activities take an enormous amount of time and effort. There are lazy, unresponsive and ineffective arts educators just as there are inadequate teachers in all specialized fields of education; but committed arts educators may be more likely than most teachers to display the sins of omission and commission that result from over-extension.

A special note is needed about the arts education specialist at the elementary level. Most often the elementary arts specialist is a special music teacher, occasionally a special art teacher and rarely a special dance or drama teacher. Usually the specialist is an itinerant traveling from classroom to classroom, frequently from elementary school to elementary school. In most cases the specialist has a dual responsibility, to teach younger students and to assist the regular elementary classroom specialist to provide additional instruction in the discipline. This support role requires that the specialist spend many hours after school with classroom generalists in training activities. The itinerant characteristic of the specialist's experience makes it very difficult to participate in school level gifted progams.

3. "Why assume that all arts disciplines are equally represented in the instructional program when they aren't?"

Instruction is a full-time assignment for a public school dance teacher only in some school systems in large metropolitan areas or in specialty high schools with a program that strongly emphasizes the arts. Much instruction in dance in the schools is a component of the physical education program. Dance is often offered as an aspect of social development and recreational opportunity. Community pressures frequently make it very difficult for school administrators to justify extended learning opportunities in dance as an art form of the regular school program.

In drama some characteristics of the situation are similar and some are different. Children's theatre is found occasionally in some suburbs and in some cities where it has been long established. On rare occasions the school system actively participates in the children's theatre program. The current economic bind in which public schools find themselves provides little support or encouragement for extension of school support for children's theatre programs. Secondary school drama and theatre arts activities typically have been viewed as an added extra curricular responsibility for one of the members of the English department. There may even be a class or two in play production or drama or theatre arts for a teacher who already has a significant instructional responsibility for several demanding English classes.

In addition all teachers of the arts in schools suffer from common problems. At the secondary level they frequently have different class preparations than those who teach the academic disciplines exclusively. At the elementary level they rarely enjoy the luxury of really knowing individual students well. They are expected to support the community outreach of the system in ways that do not apply to other teachers. There are common misperceptions about their disciplines. They become defensive

about their public attitude that they are engaged in entertainment and, therefore, should not be the beneficiaries of public support.

If the position of the art education specialist is valid for the reasons cited, what should be the expectation for their participation in programs for gifted students? The arts educator must be supported to participate in such programs. Failure to do so deprives the program of a critically important resource that can make a unique contribution to the design of special educational experiences that gifted students need. To involve the arts education specialists some problems must be considered. Among them are the following:

1. "Should all gifted students be interested in the arts?"

Those who support special programs for the gifted student, whether gifted themselves or not, tend to have personal interest in the arts. Frequently, they are active participants, often they are performers of skill and talent. Moreover, many academically gifted students are artistically talented and become able artists and performers.

Programs for gifted students commonly specify that there should be a variety of challenging experiences in the arts. Because most young people, whether gifted or not, do display some personal interest in music or film (T.V.) or art, the assumption is made that those who are gifted ought to be encouraged to display an interest in one or several of the arts as a discipline.

Organized and structured learning in the arts is as serious and complex as organized and structured learning in any other field of knowledge. Disciplined application over time is required. Arts educators know this.

However, the arts are also a source of aesthetic gratification. Untutored response in the arts can be gratifying in ways that are much more meaningful than untutored response in purely cognitive disciplines.

The personal disciplines required to be an effective learner in the arts are very demanding. Gifted students whose intellectual curiosity is enormous, may not be willing to make the level of personal commitment to disciplined learning that is required to achieve the level of satisfaction necessary as an incentive for continued progress. Intellectually gifted students without artistic talent may be far less patient if they are unable to produce satisfactory performance in terms of their personal expectations.

Experienced arts educators are aware of this characteristic of gifted students. Gifted student program leaders need increased awareness of realizable accomplishment as a prime requisite for continued learning in the arts as disciplines. Learning readiness and realistic interest should be determinants for the selection of the gifted students who do participate in arts discipline instruction.

2. "Aren't gifted students entitled to special opportunities for exposure to the arts as enrichment experiences?"

The answer is probably a qualified affirmative; however, are gifted

students any more entitled to opportunities for such exposure than any other special population of students? How much of the responsibility for such exposure is properly the responsibility of schools supported by the community and how much more properly the responsibility of parents? Why shouldn't the artistically talented child whose artistic gift is obviously unique and frequently neither recognized nor supported by the gifted student program be more entitled to such special exposure opportunities? The sustained commitment to learning in the arts discipline displayed by the obviously successful artistically talented student surely merits such exposure to a greater degree than the simple application of the identification procedure that has resulted in an award of funds that will be used to provide enrichment experiences for the students so identified. Most leaders of gifted student programs will endorse the principle expounded here but are unwilling to deal effectively with the fiscal constraint that is the source of inequitable treatment. Many arts educators may point out that they are committed as a matter of personal educational philosophy to provision of appropriately equivalent arts exposure opportunities as enrichment experiences for all children.

3. "Isn't learning in the arts disciplines satisfactory if the student has developed enough cognitive understanding to be able to appreciate great art more effectively? Why do arts educators keep insisting upon the development of performance mastery as an integral characteristic of disciplinary learning in the arts?"

Lay people and many educators often begin their personal testimony in favor of the arts by an initial disclaimer to any performance skill. "I can't sing or perform on a musical instrument, but I love music and I know a great deal about it and it has been a source of deep personal satisfaction in my life."

Wouldn't it be ridiculous to say I love reading, collect books, admire print styles, but participate only by listening to the performance of those who do read well? The arts are like reading. Performance skills are necessary for full understanding.

Research psychologists have come to understand in recent years that communications skills have been the most significant aspect of man's ability to learn. From this has risen the specialized study of psycho-linguistics. At a recent meeting of musicians and psychologists it was discovered that some recent research suggests that there may well be specialized field for study known as psycho-musicology. This field may well embody some findings about human learning that have characterized psycho-linguistics. It seems equally likely, however, that some of the characteristics of that new field of study will reveal some very different understandings about human learning than have yet been revealed by studies in the field of psycho-linguistics.

Arts educators insist that purely affective response regardless of how finely tuned through the experience of cognitive understanding of the discipline represents only a fraction of the available gain from participation in the art discipline. Most gifted persons who are active participants in one or another art form are the most significant available demonstrations that gifted students, at the appropriate time, need the opportunity to engage in learning experiences in the arts that feature opportunity for the development of performance skills.

If the assertions that have been made about gifted student programs are accurate there is a clear need for the national arts education associations to undertake some significant leadership tasks. Even if the assertions about gifted student programs are not generally accurate, the perceptions about those programs which have been described are perceptions commonly held by arts educators. Such commonly held perceptions do describe some characteristics of the environment in which any joint activity by arts education leaders and gifted program leaders must be undertaken.

II. The Arts Education Association and the National Gifted and Talented Issue

The foregoing demonstrates a need for professional leadership for arts educators as they develop relationships with programs for the gifted and talented student. It is obvious that the professional arts education associations are the groups able to assume that leadership.

The balance of this addresses itself to the arts education associations and their possible leadership roles in view of the questions raised and discussed in Part I.

In general, an arts education association is an organized group of practitioners of the arts who are active in the teaching profession. While most associations are composed of people who regard teaching as their primary profession, a few associations are composed of educational institutions. Individuals involved in both types of associations may teach at any level from pre-school through graduate school; some are administrators, faculty members in conservatories or schools, or teachers in public or private schools.

Through membership in the respective arts education associations these people publicly identify themselves as advocates of the arts in education; they make a statement about their lifelong commitment to the arts. Certainly in order to teach well they must have reached a high degree of proficiency in their art form, and many of these education association members continue to work as professional artists.

Unfortunately, there is a good deal of unnecessary snobbery in the art world concerning education. Most of this is based on misinformation and misunderstanding. The individual engaged principally as a producing artist, whether painter, sculptor, musician, dancer, or actor must necessarily focus his/her main efforts on what is being produced. If any individual is being productive in his/her art form, time for daily contact with students in a formal setting such as a school or institution is minimized.

Conversely, the teacher who spends six to eight hours daily in school with extra time needed to prepare lessons, may not have time to be prolific in productions of his/her own, especially during the academic year.

A balanced approach to the arts recognizes the necessity of both types of individual involvement and the necessity of both professional emphasis being mutually supportive in the education process.

The arts education associations work to assist cooperation between artists primarily employed as presentors and artists principally employed as educators. Exposure to performance--to great art--is an essential part of the education of young people. However, such exposure is not a complete education in itself. Thorough training in the arts is achieved through continuous curricular experiences on a day by day basis. The arts educator provides these experiences, and the arts education associations assist the arts educator.

Because of the scope and intensity of this effort, a wealth of resources are readily available through arts education associations. These include rosters of individuals available nationwide as consultants and resource persons; directories of schools offering special programs; publications on many aspects of art both academic and practical; and periodicals, newsletters and research journals. Meetings are held annually and feature workshops, seminars and symposia on pertinent subjects. These also include performances, expositions and shows. Through their state, district, and regional affiliate (when these are part of the national structure) arts education associations organize workshops on specific aspects of professional life, including teaching methods and curriculum development.

Those not familiar with the dynamics of education should recognize that teachers in all subject matter areas tend to have a deep-seated feeling that all other areas of instruction are favored and their discipline alone is singled out for neglect. An objective look at the situation usually reveals that this is not so. At least so far as the arts are concerned, there is evidence that generally there is a benevolent attitude to instruction in the arts. However, arts education is only of first importance to people whose specialty it is. Therefore, the arts education associations play a supportive role - through them the professional arts educator is allied to a power structure focussed on individual special interests.

All these activities should be brought into focus as part of an effort to assist teachers in identifying and serving the gifted child or young person. We cannot be certain how many children are truly gifted, but we do know that without a teacher's alert awareness of the possibility of exceptional talent, many youngsters will not receive that extra attention that might result in artistic development and achievement.

Working as an organized, cooperative advocacy group within the mainstream of education, arts education associations can assist in changing the ambience in schools so that all teachers can become aware of the need to be looking for the artistically gifted child.

Beyond the already intensive processes which relate to admission to college-level study, arts education associations could make the identification and education of gifted youngsters a priority in their national agendas. This could be accomplished in a variety of ways. Each state association, district, or regional association and the national association could include specifically focussed workshops at conferences. Workshops of several sessions comprising discussions on identification, on teaching methods, on desirable changes, and on personalizing instruction, since the gifted child will most likely be in the regular class. An additional possibility is in the opening of workshops and conferences to members of other associations in other arts disciplines on a collegial basis so that intracurricula expertise and knowledge can be shared.

Another approach might be to agree that in one month of the school year, all the periodicals of the arts education associations will focus on the gifted and talented child. Naturally, each association would seek articles related to its own art form, but if all were published at approximately the same time, the national impact would be strengthened, and it would be possible to gather materials for a paperback publication. Such a book would have value for administrators, school board personnel, legislators, and others.

In conclusion, we should emphasize that the arts education associations provide networks of services in support of teachers. This support supplements and enhances the efforts of postsecondary institutions. The associations provide a support system for teacher's at every level. They provide ready made communications systems and opportunities for cross fertilization and self-examination. They provide the principal national mechanism for achieving professionally acceptable and artistically oriented results.

CONCLUSION

In propounding these recommendations for action by the professional associations there is one persistent drawback. The professional associations are supported principally with membership dues and income from other sources that are equally limited. To make a more immediate and more effective attack upon specific problems, the availablity of small amounts of grant funds from Federal, state, and philanthropic sources would do much to provide needed incentives to undertake the more extended activities that the associations cannot support with their own limited resources.

The associations have the capability to marshall leadership resources which can attend to major issues in gifted and talented education. The associations can focus national attention on the problems, the issues and proposed solutions. The associations can give national visibility and endorsement to successful experiences. These advantages seem to justify some degree of special attention from the founding community.

It is recommended that the U.S. Commissioner of Education marshall the resources of the various programs with the U.S. Office of Education that may be available for the commination and discretionary deployment of grant funds in the interest of supporting initiatives by the national arts education professional organizations to deal with this challenge in increasingly effective ways. Cooperation and serious partnership between the Federal government and the associations will be more effective than separate parallel efforts.

The Gifted and Talented Amateur: Avocational Arts Education

by
Herbert J. Burgart

Introduction:

Court records may never reflect the eloquence of attorneys Antoni Tapies, Igor Stravinsky, Wallace Stevens, or Albert Gallatin in spite of their successful law studies or their recognized promise as gifted individuals. Each of these potential lawyers found his forte through his avocational interest in the arts, which ultimately became the vehicle for significant cultural change. Law clerk Henri Matisse, warehouseman Arthur Miller, and bank clerk Arnold Schoenberg all maintained an avocational interest in the arts while earning a living in a socially acceptable and financially rewarding vocation. Harriet Beecher Stowe and Suzanne Valadon first fulfilled their roles as creative artists, all the while nurturing their avocational involvement in the arts. The gifts of Frank Lloyd Wright and Robert Louis Stevenson might have been incidental compared to their actual contributions had they both remained true to their vocational training in engineering. It seems equally doubtful that the contributions of Elbert Roussel and Paul Gauguin, as sailors, would have approached their success in the arts. Horace Pippin, before becoming a painter, was an ironmonger and junk dealer. Luigi Tarisio began as a carpenter, Frederick Delius was first a bookkeeper, and Ezra Pound taught the classics in college, all before any recognition through their respective avocation in the arts. The world of medicine yielded sculptor Naum Gabo, designer Geoffrey Beene, and painter Sam Francis. Henri Rousseau was a customs official and only avocationally a painter while Christian Dior studied political science in preparation for the diplomatic service before turning to his avocational interest in the arts.

The gifted and talented (hereafter, G & T) individual may arrive at his or her appropriate vocational goal in any number of ways. The most direct and perhaps most common means reflect an early identification of ability, specialized schooling, supportive adult encouragement, social acceptance, and a reasonably secure financial future. In the arts, there appear to be a significantly large number of vocational changes previous to the G & T artist settling into the arts. It is also interesting to note that while nearly every vocational field is represented by dramatic examples of desertion in favor of the arts, the reverse is virtually non-existent. It would seem then that G & T in the arts are those who have found relatively equal and simultaneous success in one of the arts as well as another discipline. The size of this group reflects the rarity of genius.

In a careful examination of the lives of those who have made a significant contribution through the arts there appears to be a greater incidence of misplaced, subordinated, or suppressed arts vocations as one draws closer to the twentieth century. A significant number of G & T individuals spend a large proportion of their lives in generally unrelated and often unsupportive vocational commitments before discovering the arts or exerting their avocational prerogatives in the arts. Every G & T person has been faced with that terrible decision: which of their many and often diverse interests should be emphasized and which then must be subverted. All too often the insecure and financially unrewarding arts are relegated to a hope for the future to become a promise fulfilled or a well earned reward claimed once their more mundane human needs have been met successfully.

For some fortunate number of G & T the avocational arts may be conveniently maintained at a significant level of continued involvement. For others, their avocation in arts will be more remote and for an unfortunate number, they will never return the interest they once exercised in the arts. The number of frustrated composers, painters, and actors among doctors, dentists, and lawyers, were it known, would be astounding!

Equally problematic is the understated social pressures which work against G & T among minorities and women in the arts. When the question was raised as to why there were so few black applicants to the Art, Music, Theatre, and Dance departments of a state university, a young black high school senior responded, "You have to be a fool to be black and major in the arts. If you're black you already have two strikes against you in this society and you can't afford to strike out by going into a losing field. No jobs, no money, and no respect. I already have that without the arts bringing me down further!" The universal struggle for personal identity and recognition finds more productive outlets than those offered through the arts for G & T minorities. One direct result of this attitude is a more successful repression of avocational interest in the arts. Another outcome is a greater difficulty in identifying latent abilities in the arts among G & T minorities.

Women have had a particularly difficult time in finding productive fulfillment of their needs through the arts (as well as other fields). Carrying the burden of initially proving their feminine worth as a wife, mother, homemaker, hostess, etc., their frustration is magnified further by the fact that women make up fully sixty to seventy-five percent of the arts student body in American higher education but less than twenty percent of the national arts work force! With some little support from society at large, women are seeking to meet their avocational needs in the arts in a meaningful way. Over the past several years the only positive increment in higher education admissions has been among women, and in particular, part-time enrollment among women.

Coupled with the encouraging statistics relative to educational gains by women, another impressive and related set of data reflects one of the highest demands for arts education courses in the history of American education. The significance of this data is compounded by the fact that demand, hence enrollment in general, is down with a continuing prospect of declining enrollment for the foreseeable future. The arts have become the "darling" of higher education, not so much as a result of the need for the aesthetic and creative contributions the arts make to a sound academic life, but because the arts will financially bail out the education boat.

The Gifted and Talented Amateur:

As the label implies, the amateur does not earn his living from his involvement in the arts whereas the professional does earn his livelihood, in whole or part, from the sale of his art products or services. The G & T amateur in the arts must be clearly set apart from the dilettante. The dilettante on the other hand seeks to be identified with the arts but brings to bear no sense of commitment nor contribution to the arts. The amateur

may be student, artisan, or artist but there is no significant difference in degree or kind between the professional and the amateur artists, the only possible exception being the higher level of dedication (time) brought to bear in the arting process by the professional.

The G & T amateur may come from any walk of life or any level of affluence. He or she brings to bear a remarkably high level of creative and aesthetic insight to their avocational as well as vocational commitments. This rather unique group of individuals will be found, at the close of each day and weekends, turning their attention, energies, and interest to that which gives meaning to their very existence, their avocation in the arts.

The G & T amateur in the arts is an individual who possesses more than one gift or talent, at least one of which is in the arts and which is subordinated in favor of his or her vocational commitment. By the nature of this selection/decision process, this paper supports the dissolution of existing governmental parameters relative to age. Herein is the implicit requirement that the concerns of the G & T amateur in the arts are shared concerns with Continuing Education, Life-Long Learning, Adult Education, and Higher Education as with Elementary and Secondary Education.

Problem Identification:

One of the first problems which must be addressed is the absence of a substantial research base from which to draw rational conclusions about the G & T amateur in the arts. There are no nationally recognized research based, not standardized measures, with which to identify the G & T in the arts. We know little or nothing about the interrelationships which may or may not exist between "multi-vocational" interests/abilities among G & T individuals. What influence, if any, has secondary or avocational abilities had on primary vocational commitments?

As one specific example: A critical assumption is the belief, supported by government policy and arts education organization pronouncements, that early identification of G & T students in the arts is important. It is important because it is further assumed that early identification will lead to early recognition which naturally points to the need for special programs all of which will produce a greater yield of high level creative output than would otherwise be the case. While this speculation is interesting, and at least as solid as apple pie, democracy and hot dogs (motherhood having lost considerable ground recently), it is nonetheless speculation and as such deserves the serious attention of experienced arts researchers. As matters stand presently, relative to the G & T in the arts, we rely heavily on folk lore, alchemy, and old wives tales, all of which, repeated often enough, can and do become gospel truth, if not fact. To take early identification further as still another example: early identification of the G & T in the arts does have very real and significant meaning where the age commitment is critical. For example the G & T in voice, dance, and some instrumental training will need early involvement in order to initiate proper physical care and training, as well as avoid improper or even injurious training techniques.

Another serious problem which must be considered, arises out of the very system which presumes to assist the G & T individual i.e., the "special program." The New York and New Jersey High Schools of the Arts are prime examples of the "isolation-quarantine" approach to education for the G & T

in the arts. Here G & T students are forced to make decisions about their entire lives, which will have profound effect in their short and long range educations, at a much earlier time than can be honestly considered either just or rational. Certainly if we have dramatic and glaring examples of misplaced arts vocations, the reverse will be an equally difficult problem to live with.

In this attitude, G & T students, arts or otherwise, are withdrawn from the mainstream of friends, colleagues, and social environments all of which raise serious questions as to the educational insight brought to bear in such decisions. While such isolation may be ideal for that rare G & T student who knows early on in their young lives that they will prepare for and remain with a particular art career during the remainder of their lives, the point remains that this person is rare indeed. Data available belies the possibility of many more than fifteen percent of all arts majors currently enrolled in high education arts programs completing their studies in an arts field in which they will spend more than thirty percent of their lives. A significant number of former arts majors will leave the arts within five years after graduation.

The question of greatest concern in this matter is the question of the effect of current "special" G & T students, there is the equally serious problem of "acceleration" attitudes among those who teach and administer special G & T programs. The "acceleration" theory of G & T education, which philosophy I have found to be pervasive, is that if some is good, more is better. Unfortunately G & T students are most easily identified, through our present crude measures, by their need for greater challenges in the educational setting. The G & T student moves quickly through the more routine learning situations, more often than not, to seek out more rewarding challenges. As a result, intellectual capacity is identified with speed rather than critical insight and educational system promoted situations where greater amounts of work are expected from the G & T student. As more work is produced, more work is generated. This is actually the "baby-sitting" format of G & T educational programming where students are "maintained" and generally quiet. When a G & T student rails at this stupid injustice they are labeled as "under achiever" and written off as ungrateful and the seriousness of their plight is ignored. G & T students, whether in the arts or other disciplines, do not have identical needs. They do not respond to educational programs in equal ways since each student will have completely unique values, needs, and limitations.

An indirect result of the "acceleration" approach to many contemporary G & T programs is the jamming of the program with cognate studies. With an eye to arbitrary "college entrance exams," out-dated secondary school graduation requirements and the like, G & T programs accelerate cognate things and stuff, presumbly for their ease in measurement or perhaps for their immediate availability, but certainly for their acceptability. The several forgotten issues laid open here have to do with the total student's needs not merely those which relate to the measure of one's Intelligence Quotient. The arts, on the other hand are subjective, unmeasurable for the most part, elusive, void of absolutes, and among other things, difficult to teach and administer.

Relative to the problem of "cognate jams & jellies" is the next problem wherein the role of the arts in the G & T student's education is misunderstood. By the fact that the arts are often called for in G & T special programs, and the fact that cognate studies dominate such programs, arts

appreciation or arts history courses are substituted for arts experiences. These offerings are generally the cause of G & T students developing a dilettante attitude regarding the arts, for under the banner of an "integrated arts" program they are provided a dash of this and a dash of that and encouraged to believe that they have, indeed, learned the arts. Unfortunately for many G & T students, these non-arts learning experiences will be the only contact they will have with the arts in the school and college setting.

While actual arts experiences are difficult to teach and to administer, the G & T student deserves the opportunity of becoming involved with the arting process. Such pragmatic experiences in the arts require a significantly different kind of involvement on the part of the student which involvement is costly, time consuming, and requires special teachers and sympathetic administrators.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The G & T amateur in the arts, through persistence and generally in spite of the educational system, continues to pursue his or her avocational interests in the arts with amazing zeal. Often without professional assistance or criticism, seldom with any official recognition, but always with supreme hope and confidence, we have in our midst a rather large population of G & T individuals who give testimony to the fact that the "renaissance man" is very much alive and well.

While far from an exhaustive listing of problems and needs relative to the G & T amateur in the arts, the sampling provided herein will, it is hoped, whet one's appetite for a greater in-depth examination of these concerns. At the same time the actual and potential recommendations which one might consider are equally exhaustive. An attempt will be made to present several broad alternatives for consideration, all within the limits imposed by the parameters of this paper.

1. Research Needs

The entire field of education for the G & T would benefit from the creation of a national center for research and development. Such a center should take into account the many and diverse interests of the several national bureaus, departments, and endowments which have similar and appropriately related interests in the G & T. The United States Office of Education, as the focal point for national G & T education interests should lead this effort by initiating discussions, and ultimately funding, for the creation of such a comprehensive center.

A component part of such a center should be concerned with the G & T in the arts and meet three major research goals:

a. the development of basic research into learning through the arts;

b. the support of program/center directed research projects on specific topics which would meet designated center goals, e.g., the initiation of a major longitudinal study of G & T in the arts; and

c. the creation of an "ERIC" type G & T in the arts data bank which facility and support staff would be responsible for a rational and integrated collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination program.

2. Current and Future G & T Programming

Experienced arts education specialists should be consulted in an effort to create a comprehensive policy and procedure relative to arts experiences in current and future G & T special programs. Certain minimal standards should be established which would reflect both avocational and vocational goals in the arts for G & T students. These standards should then be incorporated within application guidelines for future project funding with a given percentage of funding earmarked for evaluation of policy and procedure on an annual basis.

3. Utilization of Professional Advisors

There exist highly competent advisors, consultants, and experienced educators within the ranks of national professional arts education organizations. Qualified individuals from these ranks assure appropriate combinations of field and theoretic experience, research awareness, a national purview, and a contemporary insight into arts education disciplines. It would seem appropriate that G & T concerns in the arts become shared concerns with governmental agencies and that this shared concern should be manifest in some more formal manner with professional organizations which would make best use of otherwise untapped resources. For example, G & T educational programming in the arts may well find meaningful support from community arts organizations, museums, public as well as private schools, and college and university arts programs. The point here is that ultimately G & T programs will seek out assistance in promotion of special projects directly and indirectly related to the arts. It would make good sense to involve appropriate organizational representatives in the initial stages of planning rather than after the fact.

The Aspen Conference on the Arts and the Gifted was made possible by the United States Office of Education.

This report is dedicated to the many people who have the sincere belief that the world can become a better place by encouraging everyone to strive for excellence--how better than through arts and creativity. Special acknowledgements to:

Kathryn Bloom
John Everett
Tom Hoch
Lorin Hollander
George Kaplan
Charles Moody
Muriel Mudge
Mike Murphy
Michael Newton
H. John Runkel
Murry Sidlin
Dorothy Sisk
Harold Taylor
Jane Case Wiliams
Dorothae Wolfe
Mary Hunter Wolfe
Judith Wray

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the following persons for permission to print materials developed for the conference:

Herbert Burgart
Charles Dorn
Lorin Hollander
Charles Moody
Robert Petzold
Murry Sidlin
Cliff Wing